

Imperial/TP/91-92/14
SU-GP-91-12-2

Representations of the holonomy algebras of gravity and non-Abelian gauge theories

Abhay Ashtekar^{1,2} and C.J. Isham²

¹Physics Department
Syracuse University
Syracuse
NY 13244-1130
USA

²Blackett Laboratory
Imperial College
South Kensington
London SW7 2BZ
United Kingdom

December 1991

Abstract

Holonomy algebras arise naturally in the classical description of Yang-Mills fields and gravity, and it has been suggested, at a heuristic level, that they may also play an important role in a non-perturbative treatment of the quantum theory. The aim of this paper is to provide a mathematical basis for this proposal.

The quantum holonomy algebra is constructed, and, in the case of real connections, given the structure of a certain C^* -algebra. A proper representation theory is then provided using the Gel'fand spectral theory. A corollary of these general results is a precise formulation of the “loop transform” proposed by Rovelli and Smolin. Several explicit representations of the holonomy algebra are constructed. The general theory developed here implies that the domain space of quantum states can *always* be taken to be the space of maximal ideals of the C^* -algebra. The structure of this space is investigated and it is shown how observables labelled by “strips” arise naturally.

1 INTRODUCTION

The main results of this paper are directly applicable to Yang-Mills theory, certain topological field theories including $2 + 1$ -dimensional gravity, and certain systems that model $3 + 1$ -dimensional general relativity. However, our main motivation stems from the desire to construct a non-perturbative quantisation of full $3 + 1$ -dimensional general relativity. Since this long-range goal influences several aspects of our presentation, we will first explain our motivation and then provide an outline of the concrete results contained in the paper.

1.1 Motivation

The problem of constructing a consistent (and usable) theory of quantum gravity remains one of the major challenges facing modern theoretical physics. Three contrasting schools of thought can be identified from the variety of current approaches and perspectives.

The first maintains that the construction of any consistent theory of quantum gravity will require a profound revision of the fundamental concepts of space, time and/or quantum theory. Iconoclastic approaches of this kind can be exciting and thought provoking, but they suffer from the extreme open-endedness of the problem—it is no trivial matter to rewrite the basic laws of physics. The second, less drastic, approach is exemplified by the current formulation of string theory. At a conceptual level, this employs conventional quantum theoretical ideas, but the technical framework is far removed from that of the more traditional approaches to quantum gravity in which one tries to “quantise” the standard classical theory of general relativity. In particular, the gravitational field becomes just one among an infinity of other fields, and is thereby deprived of much of the special status assigned to it by general relativity.

The third school of thought has a long history in studies of quantum gravity. The viewpoint here is that it may well be possible to quantise pure general relativity consistently, and in a way that respects the geometrical framework of the classical theory, but to do so requires the use of techniques that are quite different from the weak-field perturbative methods that, for example, have dominated most particle-physics based approaches to quantum gravity. Much effort has been devoted to finding such non-perturbative schemes, and in this paper we will be concerned with a particular one that has evolved from the introduction of a new set of canonical variables to describe the phase space of classical general relativity [1].

The central ingredient in this formalism is the complex $SO(3)$ connection ¹

$$A_a^{(i)}(x) := \Gamma_a^{(i)}(x) + iK_a^{(i)}(x) \quad (1.1)$$

where Γ is the usual connection on the bundle of orthonormal frames (triads) on the spatial 3-manifold Σ . Thus the index i ranges from 1 to 3 and can be thought of as an $SO(3)$ index, *i.e.*, Γ is a one-form on Σ taking its values in the Lie algebra of $SO(3)$. The quantity K is the usual extrinsic curvature expressed in a triadic form $K_a^{(i)}(x) := e^{(i)b}(x) K_{ab}(x)$. Here $e^{(i)}$, $i = 1 \dots 3$, is a triad of vector fields related to the three-metric γ on Σ by $\gamma_{ab}(x) = e_a^{(i)}(x) e_b^{(j)}(x) \delta_{ij}$. As in all triadic versions of general relativity, a new gauge invariance is present in which a triad transforms as $e^{(i)}(x) \mapsto \Omega^i_j(x) e^{(j)}(x)$ under the action of the gauge function $\Omega : \Sigma \longrightarrow SO(3)$. The connection property of the one-form A is confirmed by its transformation as

$$A_a(x) \mapsto \Omega(x) A_a(x) \Omega(x)^{-1} + \Omega(x) \partial_a \Omega(x)^{-1}. \quad (1.2)$$

A key property of the complex connection A is that it forms one half of a complete set of canonical variables, the other half being the triad ² fields $e_{(i)}^a$. In particular, we have the classical Poisson bracket relations

$$\{e_{(i)}^a(x), e_{(j)}^b(y)\} = 0 \quad (1.3)$$

$$\{A_a^{(i)}(x), A_b^{(j)}(y)\} = 0 \quad (1.4)$$

$$\{e_{(i)}^a(x), A_b^{(j)}(y)\} = i\delta_b^a \delta_i^j \delta^{(3)}(x, y). \quad (1.5)$$

One of the most important features of the new canonical variables is the great simplification they produce in the functional form of the constraints. Such a simplification is highly desirable because, in non-perturbative, Hamiltonian approaches, it is the quantum constraints that dictate the short-distance dynamics and general behaviour of the theory. Indeed, this is one of the main reasons for hoping that a quantisation scheme based on these variables may yield a finite and well-defined structure: a goal that has eluded all previous attempts to construct a canonical theory of quantum gravity. In the present paper, however, we are not concerned with this particular aspect of the formalism. Our interest lies rather in another aspect, namely that use of the new canonical variables has uncovered a close similarity between the kinematics of general relativity and that of Yang-Mills gauge theories. This motivated the introduction of certain quantisation techniques for gravity that are well-adapted to deal with theories of connections but

¹A complex $SO(3)$ connection is equivalent to an $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ connection.

²More precisely, $e_{(i)}^a$ are vector densities of weight 1, but we will not need to worry about these details here.

which are rather heuristic in construction. The main purpose of this paper is to give a proper mathematical meaning to the kinematical features of these quantisation schemes.

For example, (1.4) implies that the associated quantum fields $\hat{A}_a^{(i)}(x)$ commute, which suggests that these fields might be simultaneously diagonalised in a representation [2, 3] in which the state vectors are functionals Ψ on the space $\mathcal{A}$ of all connections, and where $(\hat{A}_a^{(i)}(x)\Psi)(A) := A_a^{(i)}(x)\Psi(A)$. The gauge invariance under local triad rotations can then be imposed in various ways. One possibility is to fix the gauge before quantising; another is to attempt to use gauge-invariant observables from the outset. This second possibility was developed in the important work of Rovelli and Smolin [4, 5] based on a new set of variables which exploit the fact that A is a connection. These are defined by

$$T_\alpha(A, e) := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\mathcal{P} \exp \oint_\alpha A \right) \quad (1.6)$$

$$T_{\alpha,s}^a(A, e) := \text{Tr} \left(\mathcal{P} e^a(\alpha(s)) \exp \oint_\alpha A \right) \quad (1.7)$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes the path-ordered line integral around the loop α in Σ .

These new, non-local, variables have a closed Poisson bracket algebra, and a central assumption is that there exist genuine well-defined operator equivalents in the quantum theory. Such a requirement is very non-trivial since, for example, in the case of the T -variables in (1.6) it implies that the underlying operator field $\hat{A}$ can be smeared with a Dirac δ -function concentrated on a loop, rather than with one of the smooth test functions of conventional quantum field theory. This is certainly not possible for the standard Fock space operators and, indeed, specific examples [6, 7] of Maxwell theory and $2+1$ gravity show that considerable care is needed³.

Rovelli and Smolin used the formal representation of the algebra generated by $\hat{A}_a^{(i)}$ and $\hat{e}_{(i)}^a$ in which the state vectors are functionals of gauge-equivalence classes $[A]_{\mathcal{G}}$ of connections, and argued that the operators corresponding to (1.6-1.7) can be represented on these states. For example, the T -operators of (1.6) act as

$$(\hat{T}_\alpha \Psi)([A]_{\mathcal{G}}) := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\mathcal{P} \exp \oint_\alpha A \right) \Psi([A]_{\mathcal{G}}). \quad (1.8)$$

However, no inner products were specified. This is not surprising since it is a highly non-trivial mathematical problem (and one that arises already in conventional Yang-Mills theory) to see if such functionals can be equipped with a Hilbert space structure involving a measure on the space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ of orbits of the gauge group $\mathcal{G}$ acting on $\mathcal{A}$. For example, in the case of a field theory whose configuration space is some infinite-dimensional topological vector space E , it is well known that the state vectors (and

³See also our recent work [8].

measures) have usually to be defined on the topological *dual* space E' of distributions [9, 10]. It might be anticipated that something similar happens in the present case. However, $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ has a complicated topological structure and is certainly not a vector space. So what is meant by a “distributional” analogue of an element of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$? This intriguing question is not just of mathematical interest: it also has a direct physical relevance since, as in all quantum theories, it is the inner product on the state space that yields the probabilistic predictions of the theory. This vital issue of the inner product has received scant attention in the literature so far and constitutes one of the main motivations for our investigations.

Rovelli and Smolin also constructed a “loop representation” (in which states are functionals of loops) of the algebra and suggested that the connection and loop representations can be related by a “loop transform”

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha) := \int_{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{D}([A]_{\mathcal{G}}) \text{Tr} \left(\mathcal{P} \exp \oint_{\alpha} A \right) \Psi([A]_{\mathcal{G}}). \quad (1.9)$$

Once again, we see the need to construct measures on the non-linear space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ (or its “distributional” dual).

1.2 Outline of the paper

After these motivational remarks we can now summarise the major problems addressed in the present paper.

1. We wish to discuss the construction of inner products on the vector spaces of states. In particular, we are interested in the possibility of defining measures μ on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ in order to form the Hilbert spaces $L^2(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}, d\mu)$.
2. This raises the general questions of
 - is it necessary to introduce “distributional” analogues of elements of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$?
 - what might be meant by such objects?
3. A related problem is to give a proper meaning to the loop transform defined heuristically in (1.9). In particular, which is more fundamental: the connection representation $\Psi([A]_{\mathcal{G}})$ or the loop representation $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$? And what is the precise relation between them?

To address these issues, we proceed as follows. We begin by considering the abelian quantum algebra (the “holonomy algebra”) generated by the operator version of the

T_α variables defined in (1.6). The crucial idea is to endow it with the structure of a C^* -algebra and then use the Gel'fand spectral theory to systematically analyse its cyclic representations. The key results that we need from the Gel'fand theory are the following:

1. The space Δ of maximal ideals of a commutative C^* -algebra is compact (and Hausdorff) in a natural topology.
2. The given C^* -algebra is isomorphic to $C(\Delta)$, the algebra of continuous functions on Δ .

By applying these results to the holonomy C^* -algebra we show that, in any of its cyclic representations, the Hilbert space of states can be identified with $L^2(\Delta, d\mu)$ for some regular measure μ on Δ , and that the holonomy operators act simply by multiplication. In particular, these results enable us to give a precise meaning to the formal representation (1.8) and the Rovelli-Smolín transform (1.9). Finally, we explore the structure of the space Δ which is now the “domain space” for quantum states. Not surprisingly, $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ appears as a proper subspace of Δ . We identify the elements of $\Delta - \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ as the “distributional analogues” of gauge-equivalence classes of smooth connections and present examples of such entities.

In order to endow a C^* -structure on the holonomy algebra, we are obliged to make a drastic simplifying assumption: namely, that the connection $A_a^{(i)}$ is *real*. Consequently, the main results of the present paper are applicable only to certain model systems and not to the full, $3 + 1$ -dimensional general relativity. However, the simpler systems which do satisfy this assumption are of considerable interest in their own right. They include the genuine $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory, several of the topological quantum field theories, the Husain-Kuchař [11] model for gravity, $2 + 1$ -dimensional general relativity, and the midi-superspace of $3 + 1$ -dimensional gravitational fields with one Killing vector.

The Hamiltonian structure of the Husain-Kuchař model is essentially the same as that of $3 + 1$ -dimensional general relativity *without*, however, the scalar (or, the Hamiltonian) constraint. The configuration variable in this model is a real, $SU(2)$ -valued connection. In its connection-dynamics version, $2 + 1$ -dimensional gravity is structurally very similar to the $3 + 1$ -dimensional theory in the new canonical variables [12, 13]. However, in the $2 + 1$ -dimensional case, the connection is real and flat and takes its values in the Lie algebra of $SO(2, 1)$. Finally, in the presence of a space-like Killing vector, $3 + 1$ -dimensional general relativity is equivalent to $2 + 1$ -dimensional gravity coupled to a doublet of scalar fields (which constitute a non-linear σ model). The connection is now only a part of the complete set of configuration variables. However, it is *real*, generally non-flat, and $SO(2, 1)$ -valued. Even though this last example goes a long way towards full, $3 + 1$ -dimensional general relativity, the methods developed in this paper cannot be applied directly to the full theory where the connection is genuinely complex. The

reality assumption on $A_a^{(i)}$ is therefore a severe limitation and one to which we hope to return in a later work.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2, we construct the holonomy C^* -algebra and analyse the structure of its cyclic representations. We then illustrate the underlying ideas using explicit, albeit simple, examples. In particular, we are able to give a precise mathematical meaning to the Rovelli-Smolín “loop transform” in a general setting and reveal the structure involved via examples. Section 3 is devoted to the study of the space Δ of maximal ideals of the holonomy algebra, on which states and integrals are defined, with an emphasis on its distributional elements. To find concrete examples of these entities, we first construct a large class of distributional, $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant group transformations on the space $\mathcal{A}$ that can be viewed as the vector-field analogues of the Rovelli-Smolín “momentum variables” defined in (1.7). We then show how families of such transformations, when integrated over 2-dimensional strips in Σ , can produce distributional elements of Δ . The paper concludes with a list of open issues whose resolution would greatly clarify the structure of Δ and make the task of finding physically interesting representations of the holonomy algebra more manageable.

2 REPRESENTATIONS OF THE ABELIAN T-ALGEBRA

This section is divided into four parts. In the first, we recall some basic ideas concerning holonomies of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ connections; in the second we construct the C^* -holonomy algebra; in the third we discuss its representations and provide a precise mathematical meaning to the Rovelli-Smolín loop transform; and, in the fourth, we present a few simple examples to illustrate the constructions involved.

2.1 Preliminaries

The main aim of this section is to study the general representations of the commutative operator algebra generated by the classical variables defined in (1.6). To do this properly we must start by defining these objects more carefully. First we choose some fixed base-point x_0 in the three-manifold Σ and let $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ denote the set of all continuous, piecewise smooth loops on Σ which map ⁴ the base-point $0 \in [0, 2\pi] \simeq S^1$ to $x_0 \in \Sigma$. We are interested only in parametrised loops *i.e.*, we identify the loops $\alpha : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ and $\alpha \circ \phi : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ for all orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms $\phi : S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ which map the base-point $0 \in S^1$ to itself.

⁴The points 0 and 2π are identified in the parametrisation of the points on the circle S^1 by the real numbers in the closed interval $[0, 2\pi]$.

It is important to note that $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ is a semigroup under the combination law ⁵ $\alpha, \beta \mapsto \alpha \circ \beta$ where $\alpha \circ \beta$ means the loop formed by going first around β and then around α , and where the identity element is defined to be the constant loop $x_0(t) := x_0, \forall t \in S^1$. This semigroup structure is compatible with the equivalence relation that identifies loops which differ by a reparametrisation map $\phi : S^1 \longrightarrow S^1$. However, we do not get a *group* structure in this way since, notwithstanding the notation (and occasional implications in the literature to the contrary), the inverse loop α^{-1} defined by $\alpha^{-1}(t) := \alpha(2\pi - t)$ is not a group inverse, *i.e.*, $\alpha \circ \alpha^{-1} \neq x_0$. On the other hand, the inverse loop operation is a genuine *involution* on the semigroup in the sense that, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$, $(\alpha \circ \beta)^{-1} = \beta^{-1} \circ \alpha^{-1}$, and, $(\alpha^{-1})^{-1} = \alpha$.

The next step is to consider the parallel transport around such loops associated with a connection. Although the general ideas of the paper are applicable to any gauge group, because of our interest in gravity, the most interesting case for us is $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ and subgroups thereof. For definiteness, let us therefore consider a smooth connection in an arbitrary principle $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ bundle over Σ . We will denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the set of all such connections and by $\mathcal{G}$ the gauge group of automorphisms of the bundle ⁶.

A connection should really be viewed as a one-form on the bundle space of the bundle. However, since all $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ (and $SU(2)$) bundles over a three-manifold are necessarily trivial, there always exists a global section (in the case of the bundle of frames, this is a global triad) that can be used to “pull-down” the connection one-form to give a one-form A on Σ . The parallel transport around a loop $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ is a map from the fiber over $x_0 \in \Sigma$ to itself, and can only be identified with an element of the structure group once a base point in this fiber has been chosen. In our case, the global section can be used for this purpose and, with this proviso, it is meaningful (and correct) to write the parallel transport in the familiar way as the group element $P_\alpha(A)$ defined by

$$P_\alpha(A) := \mathcal{P} \exp \oint_\alpha A \quad (2.1)$$

which belongs to $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ (or, in the real case, $SU(2)$). The T -variables are then defined on the classical phase space of all pairs (A, e) as in (1.6):

$$T_\alpha(A, e) := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (P_\alpha(A)). \quad (2.2)$$

At this point it should be re-emphasised that the physical configuration space of the system is really the quotient space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ which, with care, [14] can be given the

⁵It is conventional to use $\alpha \circ \beta$ to denote the combination of a pair of loops. However, it should be noted that the symbol $\circ$ does *not* then have its usual meaning of the composition of maps.

⁶We assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is one of the standard function spaces. If Σ is non-compact it is necessary to impose asymptotic fall-off conditions on both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ in order that, for example, $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ be a genuine infinite-dimensional manifold [14].

structure of an infinite-dimensional, topologically non-trivial, manifold. An important step in the development of a general quantisation scheme [15] is the construction of an (over-) complete set of functions on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. It is therefore significant that each T_α is a gauge-invariant functional of A and, as such, projects down to give a functional on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. In the $SU(2)$ case, these functionals form a separating set on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$: if all the T_α assume the same values at two connections, they are necessarily gauge related (this is proved in detail in section 3). In the case when the group is $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ this result continues to hold [16] except for a well-defined set “of measure zero”. Furthermore, it is often asserted that *all* gauge-invariant functionals on $\mathcal{A}$ can be written in terms of these Wilson-loop functionals, although it is difficult to find an exposition of the precise meaning of “all” and “can be written”. We will return to this issue later in section 3.

From now on we will view the T -variables as functions on the physical configuration space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$, and begin to consider the implications of their use in the quantum theory. The vanishing of the classical Poisson bracket of $A_a^{(i)}(x)$ with $A_b^{(j)}(y)$ suggests that the corresponding quantum operators should commute and hence that

$$[\hat{T}_\alpha, \hat{T}_\beta] = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$. This in turn suggests that we might start by considering the spectral theory of the abelian algebra of the operators in (2.3). However, we must first address the crucial fact that the classical T -variables are not functionally independent but instead satisfy a well-known set of identities which have their origin in the relations

$$P_\alpha(A) P_\beta(A) = P_{\alpha\circ\beta}(A) \quad (2.4)$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $P_{x_0} = 1$ this means that, for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the map $\alpha \mapsto P_\alpha(A)$ provides a matrix representation of the semigroup $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ in which $P_{\alpha^{-1}}(A) = (P_\alpha(A))^{-1}$. However, any pair of 2×2 unit determinant matrices C, D satisfy the identity

$$\text{Tr } C \text{Tr } D \equiv \text{Tr } (CD) + \text{Tr } (CD^{-1}) \quad (2.5)$$

and, in addition, any unit determinant 2×2 matrix C satisfies

$$\text{Tr } C \equiv \text{Tr } C^{-1}. \quad (2.6)$$

These identities imply in particular that the T -variables satisfy the non-linear relations

$$T_\alpha T_\beta = \frac{1}{2}(T_{\alpha\circ\beta} + T_{\alpha\circ\beta^{-1}}) \quad (2.7)$$

$$T_\alpha = T_{\alpha^{-1}} \quad (2.8)$$

which are nothing other than the famous Mandelstam relations [17] for the special case of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$. That there exist such algebraic relations between T_α is not surprising: since,

$\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is a genuine manifold with a complicated topology, *any* set of globally-defined functions that separates points of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is necessarily overcomplete. The crucial question is how these relations are to be incorporated in the quantum theory.

One possibility is to greatly reduce the number of T_α -variables by solving as many algebraic constraints as possible at the classical level *before* quantising. For example, this approach has been adopted recently by Loll in the context of a lattice approximation to the theory [18]. The other possibility, which we will explore here, is to assume that there exist genuine operator analogues $\hat{T}_\alpha$ of the classical T -variables, and then to impose the constraints on them. This could be done in various ways, and we conclude this sub-section by discussing one possibility, based on the theory of representations of groups, that has been used in the literature. However, note that the avenue we will actually follow in this paper is somewhat different. It employs the representation theory of C^* -algebras and will be discussed in detail in the next sub-section.

A first impulse may be to start with (2.4) and explore the general theory of the representations of the semigroup $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$. A priori, this is not too easy since this semigroup is not abelian, but the form of the classical T -variables suggests a modified strategy. Let us define the equivalence relation (to be denoted R) on $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$

$$\alpha \equiv \beta \text{ mod } R \text{ if } T_\alpha(A) = T_\beta(A) \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A} \quad (2.9)$$

and associate operators only with the equivalence classes $[\alpha]_R$ (following the fact that, by the definition of the R equivalence relation, the classical T -variables depend only on the equivalence classes of loops). Note that the equivalence relation implies:

$$\alpha \circ \beta \equiv \beta \circ \alpha. \quad (2.10)$$

$$\alpha \equiv \alpha^{-1} \quad (2.11)$$

$$\alpha \circ \alpha^{-1} \equiv x_0 \quad (2.12)$$

$$\alpha \circ \rho \circ \rho^{-1} \equiv \alpha \quad (2.13)$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$, where (2.13) applies for any path ρ in Σ which has an end that touches the loop α somewhere.

Now, it is tempting to try to define a product on the set $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/R$ of equivalence classes by

$$[\alpha]_R [\beta]_R := [\alpha \circ \beta]_R \quad (2.14)$$

since, by virtue of (2.10), this would yield an abelian structure. However, the meaning of $\alpha_1 \equiv \alpha_2$ is that, for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\text{Tr } P_{\alpha_1}(A) = \text{Tr } P_{\alpha_2}(A)$, and this does *not* imply that, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$, $\text{Tr } (P_{\alpha_1}(A) P_\beta(A)) = \text{Tr } (P_{\alpha_2}(A) P_\beta(A))$, which has to be the case if the definition (2.14) is to be consistent. (It works if $\alpha_2 = \alpha_1 \circ \rho \circ \rho^{-1}$ but, for example, not if $\alpha_2 = \alpha_1^{-1}$.)

One way of overcoming this problem is first to define a loop γ to be *thin* [19, 20, 21] if there exists a homotopy of γ to the trivial loop in which the image of the homotopy lies within the image of γ . Then a new relation can be introduced on $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ by saying that two loops α and β are *thinly equivalent* (denoted $\alpha \equiv \beta \bmod t$) if $\alpha \circ \beta^{-1}$ is a thin loop. Note that $\alpha \equiv \beta \bmod t$ implies $\alpha \equiv \beta \bmod R$ but not conversely. In particular, $\alpha \equiv \alpha^{-1} \bmod R$ whereas $\alpha \circ \alpha$ is generally not thin. Thus there exists a non-injective surjection $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{x_0}/R$ in which $[\alpha]_t \mapsto [\alpha]_R$. It is easy to show that a well-defined composition law on $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t$ is given by $[\alpha]_t [\beta]_t := [\alpha \circ \beta]_t$. This gives an abelian group whose representations can be studied using standard techniques. A similar path has been followed in the past [22, 23] with some success. However, in order to address the particular problems in which we are interested it is advantageous to proceed in a somewhat different way which we discuss in detail in the next sub-section. Nonetheless, the mathematical structure sketched above—especially the equivalence relations—will turn out to be useful at several points in the development of our approach.

2.2 The C^* -algebra for the T -variables

In the classical theory, the functions T_α on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ generate an abelian, associative algebra. In this sub-section, we wish to introduce an analogous algebra of quantum operators $\hat{T}_\alpha$. Thus, we wish to define quantum operators $\hat{T}_\alpha$ such that

$$\hat{T}_\alpha \hat{T}_\beta = \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{T}_{\alpha \circ \beta} + \hat{T}_{\alpha \circ \beta^{-1}} \right) \quad (2.15)$$

or, more precisely,

$$\hat{T}_{[\alpha]_R} \hat{T}_{[\beta]_R} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{T}_{[\alpha \circ \beta]_R} + \hat{T}_{[\alpha \circ \beta^{-1}]_R} \right). \quad (2.16)$$

Once again, it should be emphasised that even the assumption that the $\hat{T}_\alpha$ operators *exist* is a radical departure from conventional quantum field theory.

The crucial question is how best to study the general structure of such operators. Our approach is to construct a C^* -algebra in which the multiplication law is defined in such a way that any representation of the algebra is guaranteed to produce operators satisfying (2.16). To this end let us start by defining $\mathcal{HA}$ to be the set of all finite complex linear combinations of the classical T -variables. The key observation is that, by virtue of the classical Mandelstam identities (2.7), this vector space of functions on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is *closed* under the usual product law of functions. We will exploit this feature in our construction of the quantum algebra. Note how important it is that the structure group is $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ or a sub-group thereof: for $SU(n)$, $n \geq 3$, the Mandelstam identities involve products of *three* or more T_α variables and so the set $\mathcal{HA}$ is no longer closed under multiplication.

This is one of those relatively rare cases where there is a significant difference between $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ and any other internal symmetry group ⁷.

To construct the required quantum algebra, it is convenient to extract the essential algebraic features of $\mathcal{HA}$. To do so, let us first consider the vector space $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ of all finite, complex linear combinations of elements of $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$. Equivalently, this is the set of all complex-valued functions on $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ whose supports are finite subsets of $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$. The sum is defined pointwise in the usual way, as is the product of any finite sum by a complex number. The crucial thing is the product between a pair of finite sums $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i$ and $\sum_{j=1}^m b_j \alpha_j$. This is defined in the standard way as

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m b_j \alpha_j \right) := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m a_i b_j \alpha_i \alpha_j \quad (2.17)$$

where n and m are any finite integers, and $a_i, b_j \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence the key step is to define the product in $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ of a pair of loops $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$. We choose

$$\alpha\beta := \frac{1}{2}(\alpha \circ \beta + \alpha \circ \beta^{-1}) \quad (2.18)$$

which builds the $SU(2)$ (or $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$) Mandelstam identity into the very fabric of the algebra.

Any operator representation of this algebra will necessarily satisfy the relations (2.15). Recall, however, from section (2.1) that the classical functions T_α depend not on specific loops α but only on equivalence classes, $[\alpha]_R$. As matters stand, there is no a priori reason why any specific representation of our quantum algebra should respect the extra requirement that the operators $\hat{T}_\alpha$ depend only on the R -equivalence classes of the loops. In addition, it is hard to exploit the algebra directly since it is both non-abelian and non-associative. Finally, the constant loop x_0 is not a unit for this algebra since $x_0\beta = \frac{1}{2}(\beta + \beta^{-1})$, which does not equal β because $\beta \neq \beta^{-1}$. These problems can all be resolved by incorporating more of the properties of the classical T -variables. Specifically we consider the linear subspace K of $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ defined by

$$K := \left\{ x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i \mid \sum_{i=1}^n a_i T_{\alpha_i}(A) = 0 \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A} \right\} \quad (2.19)$$

which has the important property of being a two-sided *ideal* in the algebra $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$. For example, if $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i \in K$ then $(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i)\beta = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (\alpha_i \circ \beta + \alpha_i \circ \beta^{-1})$. However, $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (T_{\alpha_i \circ \beta} + T_{\alpha_i \circ \beta^{-1}}) = (\sum_{i=1}^n a_i T_{\alpha_i})T_\beta = 0$ and so $(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i)\beta$ also belongs to K .

⁷For the cases $n \geq 3$ it would be possible to use the algebra *generated* by products of the T_α variables. However, several of the constructions that follow would be significantly more complicated in this case.

It follows at once that $(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i)x \in K$ for all $x \in F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$, and there is a similar proof for left multiplication by x . Since K is an ideal, a product can be defined consistently on the quotient space $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K$ by $[x]_K [y]_K := [xy]_K$ where $[x]_K$ denotes the K -equivalence class of $x \in F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$.

Note that a natural map $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{HA}$ is given by $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n a_i T_{\alpha_i}$ and it is clear that the kernel is precisely K . Hence $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K$ is isomorphic to the holonomy algebra $\mathcal{HA}$ ⁸. From now on, we will denote the generators of this algebra $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K \simeq \mathcal{HA}$ either by $[\alpha]_K$, or, when there is no danger of confusion, simply by $[\alpha]$. The algebra has the following important properties:

1. It is associative and abelian.
2. It has a unit element $e := [x_0]_K$.
3. If $\alpha \equiv \beta \pmod{R}$, then $T_\alpha = T_\beta$ and hence $\alpha - \beta \in K$. Thus any operator representation of $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K$ has the desired property that $\hat{T}_\alpha$ depends only on the R -equivalence class of $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$.
4. Any representation of this algebra necessarily satisfies the operator Mandelstam identities⁹ (2.15).

Note also that there is a natural isomorphism of $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K$ with $F\mathcal{L}_{x'_0}/K$ where x'_0 is any other choice of base point. This is obtained by connecting x'_0 to x_0 with any smooth path η and then noting that the trace of the parallel transport along the curve $\eta^{-1} \circ \alpha \circ \eta$ (a loop based at x'_0) is equal to the trace of the transport around the loop α based at x_0 . Thus, although it is convenient to have a fixed base point x_0 at one's disposal, the structure of the holonomy algebra itself is *independent* of the choice of this point.

The next step is to convert $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K$ into a proper normed $\star$ -algebra to which the powerful tools of spectral theory can be applied. This can be done in several ways. If the gauge group is $SU(2)$, the most obvious approach is to exploit the fact that each classical T_α is a *bounded* function on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. This follows since any $SU(2)$ matrix M can be written in the form $M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -\bar{b} & \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}$ where $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$. Thus $|\text{Tr } M| = |a + \bar{a}| \leq 2|a| \leq 2$ which shows that $|T_\alpha(A)| \leq 1$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus we can write $\mathcal{HA} \subset B(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$ where $B(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$ denotes the set of all complex-valued, bounded functions on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. It

⁸The reason we did not just begin with $\mathcal{HA}$ but arrived at it starting from $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ is that the explicit construction brings out the algebraic structures involved. This will be useful in the next section in our discussion of representations of this algebra.

⁹It also satisfies the operator equivalent of the Mandelstam identity (2.8); *i.e.*, $\hat{T}_\alpha = \hat{T}_{\alpha^{-1}}$.

follows that a natural norm on $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K$ is

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i [\alpha_i]_K \right\| := \sup_{[A]_{\mathcal{G}} \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i T_{\alpha_i}([A]_{\mathcal{G}}) \right| \quad (2.20)$$

and it is a trivial piece of analysis to show that, for all $x, y \in F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K$, $\|xy\| \leq \|x\| \|y\|$ so that the algebra multiplication is continuous with respect to the norm topology on $\mathcal{HA}$. However, this strategy does *not* work when the group is $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ since the trace function on these matrices is not bounded; one must use a different avenue to induce a topology on $\mathcal{HA}$. We will see at the end of section 2.3 that the general framework is rather insensitive to the precise choice of topology. However, we will not discuss the available choices, since we are about to restrict ourselves to $SU(2)$ for a quite different reason.

This step is occasioned by a major problem that arises in the $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ -case when we try to convert $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K \simeq \mathcal{HA}$ into a $\star$ -algebra. The difficulty occurs already at the classical level when we enquire into the reality of the T variables defined in (2.2). For the $SU(2)$ (or, $SU(1, 1)$) case there is no problem since these variables are automatically real. This follows at once from the representation of any $SU(2)$ matrix M as $M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -\bar{b} & \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}$ with $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$, (or, of a $SU(1, 1)$ matrix as $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ \bar{b} & \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}$, with $|a|^2 - |b|^2 = 1$), whose trace $a + \bar{a}$ is always real. This result can be coded into the Banach algebra by defining the adjoint operation as

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i [\alpha_i]_K \right)^{\star} := \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i [\alpha_i]_K \quad (2.21)$$

so that, for any loop $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$, the K -equivalence class $[\alpha]_K$ is a self-adjoint element of the algebra.

When equipped with the $\star$ -operation of (2.21), $\mathcal{HA}$ becomes a commutative $\star$ -algebra whose completion with respect to the norm (2.20) is a $C^{\star}$ -algebra which will be denoted $C^{\star}(\mathcal{HA})$. This is the required holonomy $C^{\star}$ -algebra in the $SU(2)$ (or $SU(1, 1)$) case. The difficulty with the general $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ case is that, even at the classical level, there is no apparent way in which the complex conjugate $\overline{T_{\alpha}}$ can be expressed as a linear combination of the T variables. Thus, in this case, the algebra $\mathcal{HA}$ is not closed under complex conjugation. This is therefore the point at which we must make our restrictive assumption that the connection—and hence T_{α} —is real. For definiteness, in the main body of this paper, we will consider the $SU(2)$ -case and defer discussion of the $SU(1, 1)$ theory to a later work.

The $C^{\star}$ -algebra $C^{\star}(\mathcal{HA})$ is of considerable importance for the following reason. We are interested in representations of the algebra $\mathcal{HA}$. Let $\hat{R} : \mathcal{HA} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be any continuous representation of $\mathcal{HA}$ with bounded operators on some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Thus

1. $\widehat{R}(x + y) = \widehat{R}(x) + \widehat{R}(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{HA}$;
2. $\widehat{R}(xy) = \widehat{R}(x)\widehat{R}(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{HA}$;
3. $\widehat{R}(x^*) = \widehat{R}(x)^\dagger$ for all $x \in \mathcal{HA}$.

Then $\widehat{R}$ can be extended to the complete algebra $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ since $\mathcal{HA}$ is a dense subset. Conversely, any representation of $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ clearly passes to a representation of the subset $\mathcal{HA}$. Hence the continuous representations of $\mathcal{HA}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with those of the abelian C^* -algebra $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$.

Representations of C^* -algebras can be analysed systematically using the powerful machinery of Gel'fand spectral theory. The key result here is that *any commutative C^* -algebra Alg is isomorphic to the algebra $C(\Delta)$ of all continuous, complex-valued functions on the space Δ of maximal ideals in Alg* . To specify the isomorphism, let us first recall that there is a one-to-one correspondence between maximal ideals and linear, multiplicative homomorphisms h from Alg to $\mathbb{C}$ (i.e., $h(xy) = h(x)h(y)$ for all $x, y \in Alg$; for a C^* -algebra any such homomorphism also satisfies $h(x^*) = \overline{h(x)}$ for all $x \in Alg$). The Gel'fand transform which implements the isomorphism between Alg and $C(\Delta)$ is the map defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Alg &\longrightarrow C(\Delta) \\ x &\longmapsto \tilde{x} \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

where $\tilde{x}(h) := h(x)$ for all multiplicative homomorphisms $h : Alg \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

The ideal space Δ is given the Gel'fand spectral topology, which is the weakest topology such that all the functions of the form $\tilde{x} : \Delta \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $x \in Alg$, are continuous. A key result is that *in this topology, Δ is a compact, Hausdorff space*. It therefore admits regular measures with respect to which its total volume is finite. This suggests that it may be possible to represent quantum states by functions on Δ , and with the inner product defined via integrals on this space. We will see that this expectation is correct. We will also see that, for the holonomy C^* -algebra under consideration, the classical configuration space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is in fact naturally embedded in Δ . The precise structure of Δ is clearly of considerable importance to the task of understanding the quantum theory, and much of the discussion in section 3 is devoted to this problem.

We conclude this sub-section by noting certain properties of Δ which will be useful in the rest of this section. Any h in the maximal ideal space Δ of $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ defines an associated map (also denoted h) from $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ which satisfies the three conditions

$$h(\alpha)h(\beta) = \frac{1}{2}(h(\alpha \circ \beta) + h(\alpha \circ \beta^{-1})), \tag{2.23}$$

$$\text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i \in K \text{ then } \sum_{i=1}^n a_i h(\alpha_i) = 0, \quad (2.24)$$

$$|h(\alpha)| \leq 1. \quad (2.25)$$

These follow simply from the properties of the algebra $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ and the fact that h is a homomorphism. There is a partial converse to the above in the sense that any function $h : \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which satisfies (2.23–2.24) extends by linearity to give a function $h : F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K \simeq \mathcal{HA} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is a multiplicative homomorphism on the subalgebra $\mathcal{HA}$ of $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$. However, whether or not this extends to a homomorphism on $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ itself depends on the detailed behaviour of h on infinite sets of loops. In particular, imposing the boundedness condition (2.25) is not obviously sufficient to guarantee such an extension when $\mathcal{HA}$ is completed with respect to the sup-norm topology. This is one area in which it could be useful to try to find a slightly different, and more convenient, topology on $\mathcal{HA}$.

2.3 The loop transform and representations of the holonomy algebra

The results above can now be used to give a precise meaning to the representation and loop transform defined heuristically in (1.8) and (1.9) respectively. Let $\hat{R} : C^*(\mathcal{HA}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be *any* continuous representation of $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with a cyclic vector Ω . The function $\Gamma(x) := \langle \Omega, \hat{R}(x)\Omega \rangle$ defines a positive linear functional on $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$. However, $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ is isomorphic to $C(\Delta)$ via the Gel'fand transform $x \mapsto \tilde{x}$, and hence we get a continuous, positive-definite linear function $\tilde{\Gamma}$ on $C(\Delta)$ defined by

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(\tilde{x}) := \Gamma(x). \quad (2.26)$$

Since Δ is a compact space, the Riesz lemma shows that there exists some regular measure μ on Δ such that

$$\langle \Omega, \hat{R}(x)\Omega \rangle = \int_{\Delta} d\mu(h) \tilde{x}(h) = \int_{\Delta} d\mu(h) h(x) \quad (2.27)$$

and, in particular,

$$\langle \Omega, \hat{T}_{\alpha}\Omega \rangle = \int_{\Delta} d\mu(h) h([\alpha]_K) \quad (2.28)$$

where $\hat{T}_{\alpha} := \hat{R}([\alpha]_K)$.

The usual type of representation theorems follow from this result. Specifically, the set of all vectors $\{\hat{R}(x)\Omega | x \in C^*(\mathcal{HA})\}$ span (a dense subspace of) the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and hence this cyclic representation of the T -algebra is unitarily equivalent to one on

the Hilbert space $L^2(\Delta, d\mu)$ via the map $\mathcal{H} \longrightarrow L^2(\Delta, d\mu)$ defined by $R(x)\Omega \mapsto \tilde{x}$. In particular, the cyclic vector Ω is represented by the function $\Omega(h) := 1$ for all $h \in \Delta$. The associated operation of $\hat{T}_\alpha$ on $L^2(\Delta, d\mu)$ is then simply

$$(\hat{T}_\alpha \Psi)(h) := h([\alpha]_K) \Psi(h). \quad (2.29)$$

Conversely, any measure μ on the compact Hausdorff space Δ leads to a representation of the T -algebra defined by (2.29).

To summarise, *every continuous, cyclic representation of $\mathcal{HA}$ is of the following form: The Hilbert space of states is $L^2(\Delta, d\mu)$ for some regular measure $d\mu$ and $\mathcal{HA}$ acts simply by multiplication as in (2.29).*

The relation between (2.29) and the heuristic expression (1.8) is as follows. To each $SU(2)$ connection $A \in \mathcal{A}$ there corresponds a multiplicative homomorphism h_A (which depends only on the gauge-equivalence class of A) defined by

$$h_A([\alpha]_K) := T_\alpha(A) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (\mathcal{P} \exp \oint_\alpha A) \quad (2.30)$$

and extended by linearity and continuity to the whole of $C^*(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$. Thus we have a map $j : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \Delta$ with $j([A]_\mathcal{G}) := h_A$. Furthermore, according to the Gel'fand transform (2.22), the (classical) functions T_α on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ have a natural extension to Δ defined by $T_\alpha(h) := h([\alpha]_K)$. If the map $j : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \Delta$ were a bijection then (2.29) would be identical to (1.8). However, as we will see later, although the map j is one-to-one, it is not surjective and hence $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ can be viewed as a proper subset of the space Δ of maximal ideals of $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$. Thus (2.29) is a genuine (and mathematically meaningful) extension of the heuristic representation (1.8).

Similarly, we can see how the notion of a “loop transform” (1.9) arises in our formalism. To each vector Ψ in the Hilbert space $L^2(\Delta, d\mu)$ there corresponds a function $\tilde{\Psi}$ of loops defined by

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha) := \langle \hat{T}_\alpha \Omega, \Psi \rangle = \int_\Delta d\mu(h) h([\alpha]_K) \Psi(h) \quad (2.31)$$

where, we have used the fact that $h[\alpha]_K$ are real-valued.

The expression (2.31) can be regarded as a mathematically well-defined, generalised loop transform from functions of h to functions of α . Indeed, if the map $j : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \Delta$ were a bijection then (2.31) would be precisely the heuristic transform (1.9). However, as mentioned above, $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is a proper subspace of Δ , and it is in this sense that we will refer to (2.31) as a “generalised” loop transform.

Finally, note that because h_α satisfies (2.23), the action (2.29) of the operators $\hat{T}_\alpha$ can be transformed to the loop states that are in the image of the transform (2.31):

$$(\hat{T}_\beta \tilde{\Psi})(\alpha) := \int_\Delta d\mu(h) h([\alpha]_K) (\hat{T}_\beta \Psi)(h) = \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha \circ \beta) + \tilde{\Psi}(\alpha \circ \beta^{-1})) \quad (2.32)$$

This constitutes a precise version of the action of the holonomy operators on the “loop representation” introduced by Rovelli and Smolin.

It is tempting to think of the loop transform (2.31), which enables one to pass from the “connection representation” to the “loop representation”, as being analogous to the Fourier transform which enables one to pass from the position to the momentum representation in elementary quantum mechanics. While there are indeed some qualitative similarities, there are also some key differences. To see this, recall first that, in the case of the Fourier transform, the spaces of functions $f(\vec{x})$ and $\tilde{f}(\vec{k})$ can be specified a priori—they are both $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ —and the transform is an isomorphism between them. In the case of the generalised loop transform, only the space of functions on Δ is specified a priori. We do not have a direct control on the space of loop functions, independent of the transform. It is clear from (2.31) that every function $\tilde{\Psi}$ in the image of the transform must satisfy the algebraic relations: $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \tilde{\Psi}(\alpha_i) = 0$ if $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i T_{\alpha_i}(A) = 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence, the transform cannot be inverted on all loop functions.

One may think of using these conditions to specify the space of loop states on which the transform *can* be inverted. There are, however, two problems. First, the conditions themselves refer not just to loops but also to the space $\mathcal{A}$ of connections. Even if one were to ignore this point, and just use these conditions to single out permissible loop states, in general the transform may fail to be invertible. As matters stand, therefore, it seems a little premature to call (2.31) a “transform”. Furthermore, the discussion above makes it clear that the basic type of representation of the holonomy algebra is on functions on Δ , rather than loop functions. Roughly speaking, it is because the holonomy algebra is constructed from loops that its basic representations arise on functions of connections.

In fact, the most natural role for a function of loops is as the *generating functional* of a measure on Δ . More specifically, let $\Gamma : C^*(\mathcal{HA}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any linear continuous function such that $\Gamma(x^*x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in C^*(\mathcal{HA})$. In particular, for all $a_1 \dots a_n \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \bar{a}_i a_j (\Gamma(\alpha_i \circ \alpha_j) + \Gamma(\alpha_i \circ \alpha_j^{-1})) \geq 0. \quad (2.33)$$

Then the Gel’fand-Naimark-Segal construction leads at once to a representation of $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ whose generating functional (2.28) is equal to Γ . We will present a few examples of such generating functionals in section (2.4). From this perspective, (2.28) can be viewed as an analogue of the well-known expression for a conventional scalar field theory

$$\langle \Omega, e^{i\hat{\phi}(f)} \Omega \rangle = \int_{E'} d\mu(\chi) e^{i\chi(f)} \quad (2.34)$$

in which the test functions f belong to a topological vector space E and the measure is defined on the topological dual E' —typically some sort of space of distributions. Thus,

in making the idea of a loop transform rigourous, we have also provided one possible answer to the question of what constitutes the analogue for the non-linear space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ of the topological dual E' of a vector space E : it is the space Δ of all maximal ideals in the C^* -algebra $C^*(\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A})$.

Finally, it is worth emphasising that the general features of the representation theory do not depend on the details of the precise topology placed on $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$. The main effects of this topology are

1. the specific ideal space Δ that features in the representation is determined uniquely by the C^* -algebra $C^*(\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A})$, and of course this depends on the topology placed on $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$;
2. whether or not a representation $R : \mathcal{H}\mathcal{A} \longrightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is *continuous* clearly depends on the topology on $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$.

However, in all cases Δ is a compact Hausdorff space which contains $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ as a proper subset, and the representation formula (2.29), loop transform (2.31), generating function results, *etc* all still hold.

2.4 Illustrative examples

The representations that we will construct in this sub-section are rather elementary. While some of them have direct applications to certain topological field theories, none of them is rich enough to capture the full dynamics of either Yang-Mills theory or general relativity. The main motivation behind their construction is to illustrate how the general representation theory of section 2.3 works in simple examples. The main idea in all these examples is to use the Gel'fand-Naimark-Segal (GNS) construction for the C^* -algebra $C^*(\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A})$.

Let us begin with the simplest case and use it to work up to the more interesting ones. Fix a connection A_0 and consider the functional $\Gamma_{A_0}(\alpha)$ on $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ defined by

$$\Gamma_{A_0}(\alpha) := T_\alpha(A_0), \quad (2.35)$$

which can then be extended to the vector space $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ by demanding that it be linear. It is clear from (2.19) that the value $\Gamma_{A_0}(\alpha)$ of Γ_{A_0} depends only on the K -equivalence class $[\alpha]_K$ of loops to which α belongs. Hence Γ_{A_0} has a well-defined projection to the factor space $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K \equiv \mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$. Furthermore, since the topology on $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$ is defined using the sup norm on the space of continuous, bounded functionals on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$, it follows that the resulting linear functional on $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$ is continuous. It therefore admits an extension

to $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$, which we denote again by Γ_{A_0} . Note that this functional is normalised: $\Gamma_{A_0}(1) \equiv \Gamma_{A_0}([x_0]_K) = 1$, since $T_{x_0}(A)$ is just the unit function on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. Finally, Γ_{A_0} is a positive linear functional on $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{A_0}\left(\left[\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i\right]^\star \left[\sum_{j=1}^n a_j \alpha_j\right]\right) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \bar{a}_i a_j (T_{(\alpha_i \circ \alpha_j)}(A_0) + T_{(\alpha_i \circ \alpha_j^{-1})}(A_0)) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i T_{\alpha_i}\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j T_{\alpha_j}\right) = \left|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i T_{\alpha_i}\right|^2 \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

where we have used the fact that $T_\alpha(A_0)$ is real. Hence, Γ_{A_0} can serve as a generating functional in the GNS construction. The resulting Hilbert space is given by $L^2(\Delta, d\mu)$ where the measure $d\mu$ has support at just one point, $[A_0]_{\mathcal{G}}$:

$$\langle \Psi_1, \Psi_2 \rangle := \int_{\Delta} d\mu(h) \overline{\Psi_1(h)} \Psi_2(h) = \overline{\Psi_1([A_0]_{\mathcal{G}})} \Psi_2([A_0]_{\mathcal{G}}), \quad (2.37)$$

for all Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 in $L^2(\Delta, d\mu)$. Hence the Hilbert space is just 1-dimensional. The action of the algebra on states is given by (cf (2.2)):

$$(\widehat{T_\alpha} \Psi)(h) = h([\alpha]_K) \Psi(h) = T_\alpha(A_0) \Psi(h). \quad (2.38)$$

It is straightforward to construct finite-dimensional representations by using convex linear combinations of positive linear functionals of this type. For our second example therefore let us fix n gauge-inequivalent connections A_i , $i = 1 \dots n$, and set

$$\Gamma_{\{A_i\}} := \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \Gamma_{A_i}, \quad (2.39)$$

where c_i are real positive constants that sum to 1, and where Γ_{A_i} is obtained by replacing A_0 by A_i in (2.35). The measure is now concentrated at just the n points $[A_1]_{\mathcal{G}}, \dots, [A_n]_{\mathcal{G}}$ of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$, and the Hilbert space of states is n -dimensional. The loop transform (2.31) can be performed easily:

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha) := \int_{\Delta} d\mu(h) h([\alpha]_K) \Psi(A) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \Psi([A_i]_{\mathcal{G}}) T_\alpha(A_i). \quad (2.40)$$

The loop states $\tilde{\Psi}_i(\alpha) \equiv T_\alpha(A_i)$ provide a natural orthonormal basis in the loop representation. These basis vectors are simultaneous eigenstates of the holonomy operators $\widehat{T}_\beta$ with eigenvalues $T_\beta(A_i)$.

More interesting examples result from convex superpositions of the positive linear functionals that arise from gauge-equivalence classes of connections belonging to finite-dimensional surfaces in $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. A natural class of such surfaces is the moduli space of

flat connections; the resulting representations are then relevant to topological field theories. For definiteness, for our third example, let us suppose that the underlying spatial 3-manifold Σ has the topology of a 3-torus T^3 , and analyse the structure of the corresponding moduli space. Recall first that the gauge-invariant information in a connection can be coded in the holonomy group it defines (which, in our case is a subgroup of $SU(2)$.) If the connection is flat, the holonomy around any closed loop depends only on the homotopy class of the loop, and we have a homomorphism from the homotopy group of Σ onto the holonomy group of that connection. Now, since the homotopy group of T^3 is abelian, it follows that the holonomy group of any flat connection must also be abelian. Hence we conclude that any flat connection is gauge equivalent to $A = (\sum_{j=1}^3 a_j d\varphi_j)(i\tau^3)$, for some choice of real constants a_j , where φ_j are the three angular coordinates on Σ and $\tau^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ is the third Pauli matrix. Finally, it is straightforward to check that the connections that result from a_j and $a_j + n_j$ are gauge equivalent for any choice of integers n_j . Therefore, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ of flat connections has again the topology of a 3-torus, coordinatised by $a_j \in [0, 1]$.

With this information at hand, we can now define our generating functional for the GNS construction. Let us set

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) := \int_{\mathcal{M}} dV(A) \Gamma_A(\alpha) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} dV(A) T_{\alpha}(A), \quad (2.41)$$

and, for simplicity, choose the obvious volume element on $\mathcal{M}$; $dV(A) = \Pi_j da_j$. Again, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$, is obtained as a convex superposition of the continuous, normalised positive linear functionals Γ_A and is therefore itself a continuous, positive linear functional on $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$. Furthermore, since the volume of $\mathcal{M}$ with respect to $dV(A)$ is equal to one, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$ is normalised. It therefore defines a representation of $\mathcal{HA}$ via the GNS construction. To make the resulting representation explicit, let us note that each loop α on Σ defines three integers, n_1, n_2, n_3 that label the homotopy class to which α belongs: n_j is the number of times that α winds around the j -th generator of the homotopy group of Σ . Since for any $[A]_{\mathcal{G}}$ in $\mathcal{M}$, the number $T_{\alpha}(A)$ depends only on the homotopy class of α , the generating function $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$ depends on α only through n_j .

Finally, the quantity $T_{\alpha}(A)$ can be computed explicitly in terms of n_j and a_j as $T_{\alpha}(A) = \cos(2\pi \sum n_j a_j)$. Hence, the expression for the generating functional simplifies to:

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}(n_j) = \int_0^1 da_1 \int_0^1 da_2 \int_0^1 da_3 \cos 2\pi(n_1 a_1 + n_2 a_2 + n_3 a_3). \quad (2.42)$$

The resulting GNS representation now yields the *infinite-dimensional* Hilbert space $L_+^2(\mathcal{M}, dV(A))$ of square-integrable functions on $\mathcal{M}$ that are even under the reflection $a_j \mapsto -a_j$. (The odd functions yield another irreducible representation that arises from a different generating functional.) Nonetheless, this representation of $\mathcal{HA}$ has a large kernel: if $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i T_{\alpha_i}(A) = 0$ for all $[A] \in \mathcal{M}$, the operator $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \hat{T}_{\alpha_i}$ is equal to zero.

Finally, note that the generating functional is invariant under the action of the group $\text{Diff}_0(\Sigma)$ of small diffeomorphisms on Σ (*i.e.*, those that are homotopic to the identity map on Σ); in fact *each* quantum state is left invariant by this action. This is the kind of generating functional that one hopes to use in non-perturbative quantum gravity. The loop transform (2.31) has a particularly attractive form in this case. We have:

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} dV(A) T_\alpha(A) \Psi(A), \quad (2.43)$$

so that $\tilde{\Psi}(\mathcal{A})$ depends only on the 3 integers n_j , and its functional form is given simply by:

$$\tilde{\Psi}(n_1, n_2, n_3) = \int_0^1 da_1 \int_0^1 da_2 \int_0^1 da_3 \cos 2\pi(n_1 a_1 + n_2 a_2 + n_3 a_3) \Psi(a_1, a_2, a_3). \quad (2.44)$$

So now the loop transform is essentially the Fourier transform!

The main steps of our construction go through even if the topology of the underlying manifold Σ is more complicated. However, in general, the structure of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ would be more complicated and one may not be able to provide explicit expressions for the inner product and the loop transform. Nevertheless, the general features persist: the generating functionals analogous to (2.41)—and all quantum states—are invariant under $\text{Diff}_0(\Sigma)$; up to unitary equivalence, the representations are insensitive to the choice of the volume element $dV(A)$ on $\mathcal{M}$; and, the loop states are functions only of homotopy classes of loops.

In spite of the fact that the Hilbert space in the last example is infinite dimensional, the effective configuration space $\mathcal{M}$ has only a finite number of degrees of freedom. For our fourth example, therefore, we will consider a case in which the number of degrees of freedom is genuinely infinite. The idea is to construct measures that, roughly speaking, are concentrated on (the distributional dual to) the space of abelian connections, and to use the Poincaré invariant, Gaussian measure of the abelian theory. For simplicity, let Σ be the vector space $\mathbb{R}^3$ and introduce on it a fixed flat metric of Euclidean signature. Denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the space of $SU(2)$ connections A_a which, in some fixed gauge, are of the type $A_a^{(i)} = A_a \delta_3^{(i)}$, for some divergence-free 3-form A_a on Σ . Clearly, $\mathcal{C}$ has the structure of a vector space: it is isomorphic to the space of gauge-equivalence classes of $U(1)$ connections. We can therefore borrow ideas from the quantum theory of the free Maxwell field.

Let us begin by recalling the relevant notions from that theory¹⁰. Given any loop α , a distribution-valued, divergence-free vector density $F^a(\alpha, \vec{x})$ can be defined on Σ by

$$\int d^3 \vec{x} F^a(\alpha, \vec{x}) \omega_a := \oint_\alpha dl^a \omega_a, \quad (2.45)$$

¹⁰For details on form factors and the loop transform in the $U(1)$ -case, see [6]

for all test 1-forms ω_a on Σ . The quantity $F^a(\alpha, \vec{x})$ is called the *U(1)-form factor* of α and can be expressed more directly as $F^a(\alpha, \vec{x}) = \oint_\alpha dl^a(s) \delta^{(3)}(\vec{x}, \vec{\alpha}(s))$, where s is any parameter along the loop $\vec{\alpha}(s)$ in Σ . It is useful to introduce a *smeared form factor* $F_\epsilon^a(\alpha, \vec{x})$ via:

$$F_\epsilon^a(\alpha, \vec{x}) := \oint_\alpha dl^a(s) f_\epsilon(\vec{x} - \vec{\alpha}(s)) \quad (2.46)$$

where $f_\epsilon(\vec{y}) := (2\pi\epsilon^2)^{-3/2}(\exp -\frac{|\vec{y}|^2}{2\epsilon^2})$. For each positive value of ϵ , the smeared form factor is a smooth vector density (which belongs to the Schwartz space) and its limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ is the distributional form factor (2.45). Its Fourier transform is given by $F_\epsilon^a(\alpha, \vec{k}) = (\exp -\frac{\epsilon^2 \vec{k}^2}{2}) \cdot \oint_\alpha dl^a(s) \exp(-i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{\alpha}(s))$, which is again an element of the Schwartz space for each positive ϵ and each loop α .

After these preliminaries, we can now define positive linear functionals $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ —one for each choice of ϵ —that are adapted to these abelian connections:

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{C},\epsilon}(\alpha) := \exp -\frac{1}{4} \int \frac{d^3 \vec{k}}{|\vec{k}|} |F_\epsilon^a(\vec{k})|^2. \quad (2.47)$$

As before, we can extend this functional by linearity and check, by a direct calculation, that it is indeed a positive linear functional. In fact, it is closely related to the vacuum expectation functional in the Maxwell theory:

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{C},\epsilon}(\alpha) = \langle 0 | \cos \int d^3 \vec{x} F_\epsilon^a(\alpha, \vec{x}) \hat{A}_a(\vec{x}) | 0 \rangle, \quad (2.48)$$

where $|0\rangle$ is the Poincaré invariant vacuum, and $\hat{A}_a$ is the operator-valued distribution defined by the divergence-free connection in the Maxwell theory. (Recall that the trace of the $SU(2)$ -holonomy of the connection $A_a(\vec{x})\delta_3^{(i)}$ around the loop α is $2 \cos \oint_\alpha dl^a A_a$.) The Hilbert space of states provided by the GNS construction can again be regarded as the space of square-integrable functionals on Δ , the measure being concentrated on the distributional dual of $\mathcal{C}$. As in the previous example, this representation has a large kernel: if $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i T_{\alpha_i}(A) = 0$ for all A in $\mathcal{C}$, the operator $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \hat{T}_{\alpha_i}(A)$ vanishes. Finally, the loop transform is well-defined. Furthermore, as in the previous examples, one can provide a characterisation of the loop states directly, without any recourse to the transform.

All these representations are continuous and hence extend to the C^* -completion of $\mathcal{HA}$. There exist, however, some interesting representations of $\mathcal{HA}$ that fail to be continuous with respect to the topology we have introduced and which therefore cannot be so extended; as matters stand, they lie outside the general framework of section 2.3. A

particularly interesting one arises from the positive linear functional

$$\Gamma(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } [\alpha]_K = [x_0]_K \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (2.49)$$

where, as before, x_0 denotes the trivial loop. This generating functional is diffeomorphism invariant, and hence the resulting Hilbert space carries a unitary representation of $\text{Diff}_0(\Sigma)$. The analogous representation of the $U(1)$ C^* -algebra has the property that the flux of the electric (or, magnetic) field through any 2-surfaces is quantised. In the full gravitational case, these representations also appear to play an important role. At the end of section 2.2 we saw that there are reasons to explore alternative topologies on $\mathcal{HA}$. The existence of these positive linear functionals provides another motivation for such a step.

3 STRUCTURE OF THE IDEAL SPACE Δ

The space Δ is the domain space of quantum states, and hence, to gain a further understanding of the quantum theory it is necessary to study its structure in more detail. We begin in sub-section 3.1 by showing that the space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ of smooth connections modulo gauge transformations is indeed embedded in Δ . In 3.2, we show that every element h of Δ defines a representation of the semi-group $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ by 2×2 matrices such that $h(\alpha)$ is given by the trace of the matrix representing α . If h happens to come from an element of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$, the matrix is just the holonomy about the loop α defined by a smooth connection. For a general h , however, there is no guarantee that there exists an underlying smooth connection. In the last two sub-sections, we explore the structure of $\Delta - \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$, the space of the “distributional analogues of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ ”. In particular, we construct a large family of these distributional elements. To what extent this family exhausts $\Delta - \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ remains, however, an open question.

3.1 The role of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$

Let us start by considering the map $j : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \Delta$, defined above ¹¹ as $j([A]_{\mathcal{G}}) := h_A$, for which we have the following important result.

Theorem

The map $j : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \Delta$ is one-to-one.

¹¹We will sometimes write h_A as $h_{[A]_{\mathcal{G}}}$ to emphasise the fact that h_A depends only on the gauge equivalence class of the connection A .

Proof

Let $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $j([A]_G) = j([B]_G)$. This implies that, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$,

$$\text{Tr}(P_\alpha(A)) = \text{Tr}(P_\alpha(B)). \quad (3.1)$$

For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the map $P_A : \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \rightarrow SU(2)$ defined by $P_A(\alpha) := P_\alpha(A)$ is a homomorphism (cf (2.4)) from the semigroup $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ into the group $SU(2)$. Since loops that are thinly equivalent possess the same holonomy, this map projects down to give a homomorphism of the group $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t$ of thin loops to $SU(2)$. In terms of these homomorphisms, (3.1) can be rewritten as

$$\text{Tr}(P_A([\alpha]_t)) = \text{Tr}(P_B([\alpha]_t)). \quad (3.2)$$

Now suppose that $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t$ has been given some topological structure so that it becomes a topological group¹² and such that, for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, P_A is a continuous function on $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t$. If $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t$ were compact we could apply to (3.2) the well-known theorem that a representation of a compact topological group is determined up to unitary equivalence by its trace. However, $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t$ is an infinite-dimensional space and is therefore most unlikely to be compact.

On the other hand, there is the general result [24] that to any topological group G there is associated a compact group $\gamma[G]$ and a continuous homomorphism $L : G \rightarrow \gamma[G]$ such that any continuous homomorphism $\phi : G \rightarrow H$ from G to a compact group H factors through $\gamma[G]$, *i.e.*, there exists some continuous homomorphism $\theta : \gamma[G] \rightarrow H$ such that $\phi = \theta \circ L$. Furthermore, the image of G by L is dense in $\gamma[G]$. When applied to the case in hand (remembering that $SU(2)$ is a compact Lie group) this shows that there exists some compact topological group $\gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t]$, a map $L : \mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t \rightarrow \gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t]$, and a family of continuous homomorphisms $\theta_A : \gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t] \rightarrow SU(2)$ such that $P_A = \theta_A \circ L$. Then (3.2) implies that, for all g in the image of $L : \mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t \rightarrow \gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t]$,

$$\text{Tr}(\theta_A(g)) = \text{Tr}(\theta_B(g)). \quad (3.3)$$

However, the trace operation is a continuous function on $SU(2)$, and θ_A is a continuous function on $\gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t]$. Hence $\text{Tr} \circ \theta_A : \gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. Moreover, every complex-valued continuous function on a compact topological group is uniformly continuous, and hence, since the image of $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t$ is dense in $\gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t]$, the equality (3.3) can be extended to the whole of the compact group $\gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t]$. But then, by the theorem mentioned above, the equalities of the traces in (3.3) implies that there exists some unitary matrix V such that, for all $g \in \gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t]$, $\theta_B(g) = V\theta_A(g)V^{-1}$. In particular, this is true for $g = L([\alpha]_t)$ and hence, since $P_A([\alpha]_t) = \theta_A(L([\alpha]_t))$, we see that $P_B([\alpha]_t) = VP_A([\alpha]_t)V^{-1}$, *i.e.*, there exists a unitary matrix V such that, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$,

$$P_\alpha(B) = VP_\alpha(A)V^{-1}. \quad (3.4)$$

¹²For example, J. Barrett in [21].

However, if $\tau_\Omega(A)$ denotes the transform (1.2) of A under the gauge function Ω , the holonomy function P_α transforms as $P_\alpha(\tau_\Omega(A)) = \Omega(x_0)P_\alpha(A)\Omega(x_0)^{-1}$. Furthermore, Anandan¹³ has shown [20] that if the holonomy maps of a pair of connections are related as in (3.4) then they are connected by some gauge transformation. Hence (3.4) implies that $[A]_\mathcal{G} = [B]_\mathcal{G}$, which proves that $j : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \Delta$ is one-to-one. **QED**

This theorem shows that $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ can be regarded as a subset of Δ . This raises two important questions:

1. What is the *image* of the map $j : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \Delta$? In particular
 - (a) is it *equal* to Δ ?
 - (b) If not, is it a *dense* subset of Δ ? If so, any multiplicative homomorphism can be approximated arbitrarily closely by one of the form $h_{[A]_\mathcal{G}}$, $[A]_\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. This is typically the situation in conventional quantum field theory where the topological vector space E —the classical configuration space—is densely embedded in the dual space E' of distributions.
2. What *topology* is induced on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ by the Gel'fand spectral topology on Δ ? Is it anything like a normal function space topology or is it rather wild, as spectral topologies sometimes tend to be?

These questions address directly the issue of the precise form of the “distributional” analogue of members of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$, defined to be those elements of Δ that do not belong to the subset $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$.

One possible path forward lies in the existence of a different way of looking at our constructions which throws some light on the form of Δ . So far we have not exploited the freedom in the choice of topology that may be placed on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. However, with respect to any of the standard topologies the classical T -functions are continuous as well as bounded, so that $\mathcal{HA} \subset C_b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$ where $C_b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$ denotes the set of all complex-valued, bounded continuous functions on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. Now suppose that the topology on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is such that it is a *completely regular* space¹⁴ (this is certainly the case for any of the standard metric topologies on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$). Then a well-known result is that

$$C_b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}) \simeq C(\beta(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})) \tag{3.5}$$

¹³See also S. Kobayashi, in [25].

¹⁴A topological space X is said to be completely regular if, for each $x \in X$ and each open neighbourhood U of x , there is a continuous function $f : X \longrightarrow [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x) = 0$ and f is identically one on the complement $X - U$ of U in X .

where $\beta(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$ denotes the Stone-Cech compactification of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. In particular, this implies that the maximal ideal space of the Banach algebra $C_b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$ is isomorphic to $\beta(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$.

On the other hand, $C^*(\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A})$ is the C^* -algebra completion of $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/K \simeq \mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$, and suppose it could be shown that $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$ is actually a *dense* subspace of $C_b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$ (equipped with its usual sup-norm topology). Then the C^* -algebra completion of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$ would be equal to $C_b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}) \simeq C(\beta(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}))$, and it would follow that the space Δ of maximal ideals of $C^*(\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A})$ is equal to $\beta(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$. This would add considerably to our understanding of the map $j : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \Delta$ since it would imply that

1. Δ is the Stone-Cech compactification of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$;
2. the image of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ in Δ is *dense* in Δ ;
3. the topology induced on the subspace $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is precisely its *given* one.

Hence a key question is whether $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$ is a dense subset of $C_b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$. The assumption that something like this is true is really implicit in the use of the T -variables in the first place, *i.e.*, we come now to the question of the precise meaning of the claim that all gauge-invariant functions on $\mathcal{A}$ can be written in terms of the T -variables.

First we note that $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$ is certainly a *separating* set of functions on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. For suppose that $T_\alpha(A) = T_\alpha(B)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$. Then $\text{Tr}(P_\alpha(A)) = \text{Tr}(P_\alpha(B))$ and, as shown in the theorem above, this implies that A and B are gauge-related, *i.e.*, $[A]_{\mathcal{G}} = [B]_{\mathcal{G}}$. Hence, if A and B are not gauge-equivalent, there must exist some α such that $T_\alpha(A) \neq T_\alpha(B)$, which is precisely what is meant by saying that $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$ is a separating set of functions on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$.

One property of the Stone-Cech compactification is that any bounded continuous function on the dense set $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} \subset \beta(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$ has a unique extension to $\beta(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$. In particular, this is true for the elements of the (self-adjoint) holonomy algebra $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$. Hence, if the set of all functions obtained in this way separates the points of $\beta(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$, the desired result would follow at once from the Stone-Weierstrass theorem. The same would apply if $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ were a compact space, and hence equal to its own compactification. However, in any of its typical metric topologies $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is certainly not compact, or even locally-compact, and in fact all that can be deduced from the Stone-Weierstrass theorem is that $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$ is dense in $C_b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}; c)$: the function space equipped with the *compact-open* topology, not the sup-norm topology used in the spectral theory above.

An extension of the Stone-Weierstrass theorem to completely regular spaces has been given by Hewitt [26] but this requires the elements of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{A}$ to separate certain closed subsets (rather than just points) of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$, and it is not obvious how to apply this criterion

in our case. This problem is not trivial since Hewitt showed that in any completely regular space X which is not compact, there necessarily exists some family of continuous, bounded functions which separates the points of X and yet which is *not* dense in $C_b(X)$. In the case of interest we have no instinctive feeling about this, one way or the other. However, even if it *could* be shown that $\mathcal{HA}$ is densely embedded in $C_b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G})$ with the sup-norm topology, this would not give us much idea of what a general element of Δ actually looks like since the Stone-Cech compactification of a space is an abstract procedure involving ultrafilters and hence, ultimately, the axiom of choice. For this reason we will continue our hunt for distributional analogues of elements of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ in a more direct way.

3.2 Matrix representations of elements of Δ

The elements h_A of Δ defined by (2.30) are traces of 2×2 matrices, and we wish now to show that every member of Δ can be written in this way (although there is no guarantee that the matrix is the holonomy of a smooth connection on Σ). This result will be relevant in the next sub-section where we will search for concrete examples of “distributional” multiplicative homomorphisms.

Every $h \in \Delta$ generates a real-valued function on $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$, also denoted h , which satisfies the three conditions (2.23–2.25). Putting $\beta = x_0$ in (2.23) shows that

$$h(x_0) = 1 \tag{3.6}$$

while putting $\alpha = x_0$ gives $h(\beta) = \frac{1}{2}(h(\beta) + h(\beta^{-1}))$ so that, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$,

$$h(\alpha) = h(\alpha^{-1}). \tag{3.7}$$

Finally, since $h(\alpha)h(\beta) = h(\beta)h(\alpha)$, we have $h(\alpha \circ \beta) + h(\alpha \circ \beta^{-1}) = h(\beta \circ \alpha) + h(\beta \circ \alpha^{-1})$ which, using (3.7) and the fact that $\beta \circ \alpha^{-1} = (\alpha \circ \beta^{-1})^{-1}$, implies that, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$,

$$h(\alpha \circ \beta) = h(\beta \circ \alpha). \tag{3.8}$$

If $h : \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies (2.24), and if α and β are thinly equivalent, then $h(\alpha) = h(\beta)$, and hence h projects down to give a function on the group $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t$ which still satisfies (3.8). If this group were *compact* this would imply that $h(\alpha)$ is proportional to the trace of some representation of the group. In fact, $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t$ is not compact, but this could be overcome by introducing the compact group $\gamma[\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/t]$ used in the proof of the earlier theorem.

A somewhat different approach is to exploit the ideas of Giles [22] which have the advantage of leading to a specific representation of the semigroup $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ whose trace is equal to h .

Theorem

Every element h in the maximal ideal space Δ of the C^* -algebra $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ can be written as the trace of a 2×2 matrix. More precisely, for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ there exists a 2×2 complex matrix V_α such that $\alpha \mapsto V_\alpha$ is a matrix representation of the semigroup $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ and $h(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}(V_\alpha)$.

Proof

The first step is to consider once more the free vector space $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ but where the product law is now defined (cf (2.17–2.18)) as

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m b_j \alpha_j\right) := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m a_i b_j \alpha_i \circ \alpha_j \quad (3.9)$$

and the adjoint operation (cf (2.21)) is:

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i\right)^* := \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i \alpha_i^{-1}. \quad (3.10)$$

The identity element e is just the constant loop x_0 .

For any given $h \in \Delta$ (necessarily satisfying (2.23–2.25)) we define the subspace

$$I_h := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i \in F\mathcal{L}_{x_0} \mid \sum_{i=1}^n a_i h(\alpha_i \circ \beta) = 0 \text{ for all } \beta \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \right\}. \quad (3.11)$$

It is easy to show that I_h is a two-sided ideal in $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$, and hence we can construct the algebra $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/I_h$. The basic relation (2.23) shows that

$$\alpha^2 - 2h(\alpha)\alpha + e = 0 \text{ mod } I_h \quad (3.12)$$

which suggests writing this expression in the factorised form

$$\alpha^2 - 2h(\alpha)\alpha + e = (\alpha - \lambda_1(\alpha)e)(\alpha - \lambda_2(\alpha)e) \quad (3.13)$$

where the complex quantities $\lambda_1(\alpha), \lambda_2(\alpha)$ are defined by

$$\lambda_1(\alpha) := h(\alpha) + i(1 - h(\alpha))^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (3.14)$$

$$\lambda_2(\alpha) := h(\alpha) - i(1 - h(\alpha))^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.15)$$

Note that both square roots give real numbers because of the boundedness condition $|h(\alpha)| \leq 1$. For any α with the property that $\lambda_1(\alpha) \neq \lambda_2(\alpha)$, we can construct the following objects

$$\rho_1(\alpha) := (\lambda_1(\alpha) - \lambda_2(\alpha))^{-1}(\alpha - \lambda_2(\alpha)e) \quad (3.16)$$

$$\rho_2(\alpha) := (\lambda_2(\alpha) - \lambda_1(\alpha))^{-1}(\alpha - \lambda_1(\alpha)e) \quad (3.17)$$

which, by virtue of (3.12–3.13), are projection operators in the algebra $F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/I_h$:

$$(\rho_1(\alpha))^2 = \rho_1(\alpha) \text{ and } (\rho_2(\alpha))^2 = \rho_2(\alpha) \quad (3.18)$$

and which are “orthogonal” in the sense that $\rho_1(\alpha)\rho_2(\alpha) = \rho_2(\alpha)\rho_1(\alpha) = 0$. Clearly we also have $\rho_1(\alpha) + \rho_2(\alpha) = e$.

Let us fix once and for all a particular $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ for which $\lambda_1(\gamma) \neq \lambda_2(\gamma)$. Then a key result of the definitions above is the equation

$$h(\alpha\rho_1(\gamma))h(\beta\rho_2(\gamma)) = \frac{1}{2}h(\alpha\rho_1(\gamma)\beta\rho_2(\gamma)) \quad (3.19)$$

which holds for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$. Now choose any pair of elements $a, b \in F\mathcal{L}_{x_0}/I_h$ such that $h(\rho_1(\gamma)a\rho_2(\gamma)b) \neq 0$. Then it follows from (3.19) that [22] the following 2×2 matrix (in which ρ_1 and ρ_2 are both evaluated at the chosen $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$)

$$V_\alpha := \begin{pmatrix} 2h(\rho_1\alpha) & h(\rho_1\alpha\rho_2b)/h(\rho_1a\rho_2b) \\ 2h(\rho_1a\rho_2\alpha) & 2h(\rho_2\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.20)$$

satisfies the representation law $V_\alpha V_\beta = V_{\alpha\circ\beta}$. Furthermore, it is clear that $h(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}(V_\alpha)$, which proves the desired result ¹⁵. **QED**

Hence we see that for any element $h \in \Delta$ there exists some 2×2 representation $\alpha \mapsto V_\alpha$ of $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ such that $h(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}(\text{Tr } V_\alpha)$. The possibility now arises of constructing distributional analogues of elements of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ by finding elements $h \in \Delta$ where the corresponding matrix V_α depends on a distributional version of a connection A but in such a way that the trace still satisfies the defining conditions for h to be a genuine element of Δ . We will see in the following sub-sections how this can be done.

3.3 Group transformations on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$

We wish now to turn to the problem of finding group transformations on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. There are two distinct, but related, reasons for this. The first is that, at least formally, it leads to a set of elements of Δ that are not of the form h_A with A a smooth connection. The main idea is to extend the definition (2.30) to “distributional” connections of the form $A + \Theta$ where $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is a standard smooth connection and Θ is a distributional, Lie-algebra valued, one-form on Σ that transforms homogeneously under the operation of the gauge group. This extension is based on the observation that the right hand side of (2.30) is defined on a larger class of one-forms than those contained in $\mathcal{A}$: all that is necessary is that the integral of $A + \Theta$ over α be well-defined, and this includes, for example,

¹⁵If V_α is to be unitary, the elements g, g' must be chosen accordingly.

one-forms Θ that have a $\delta^{(1)}$ singularity. The map $A \mapsto A + \Theta$ can then be viewed as a $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant group transformation from connections to (distributional) connections.

The second reason for studying transformations of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is that it gives a geometrical way of understanding the origin of the T^1 -variables of Rovelli and Smolin. Indeed, the T -functions considered so far depend only on the configuration variables A and must be supplemented with observables that involve the conjugate momenta e too. In the quantum theory of a system with a finite-dimensional configuration space Q , such observables typically arise from group transformations on Q with the natural symplectic two-form on T^*Q being used to associate a function on T^*Q with each vector field on Q that generates an infinitesimal transformation.

In the present context this raises the interesting, and mathematically non-trivial, question of how to find group actions on the space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ of physical Yang-Mills configurations (or, since this space is infinite-dimensional, perhaps on its “distributional dual”). For the moment we will not specify the internal symmetry group G but let it be an arbitrary real Lie group—we will see later how, once again, the choice $G = SU(2)$ is rather special.

One obvious class of transformations on the space of connections $\mathcal{A}$ is

$$A(x) \mapsto (\lambda_\phi A)(x) := A(x) + \phi(x) \quad (3.21)$$

where ϕ is any one-form on Σ taking its values in the Lie algebra $L(G)$ of G . However, the connection A is also subject to the gauge transformation¹⁶ (1.2)

$$A(x) \mapsto (\tau_\Omega A)(x) := \Omega(x)A(x)\Omega(x)^{-1} + \Omega(x)d\Omega(x)^{-1} \quad (3.22)$$

and (3.21) is not equivariant with respect to this operation. Indeed,

$$(\tau_\Omega(\lambda_\phi A))(x) = \Omega(x)A(x)\Omega(x)^{-1} + \Omega(x)d\Omega(x)^{-1} + \Omega(x)\phi(x)\Omega(x)^{-1} \quad (3.23)$$

whereas

$$(\lambda_\phi(\tau_\Omega A))(x) = \Omega(x)A(x)\Omega(x)^{-1} + \Omega(x)d\Omega(x)^{-1} + \phi(x) \quad (3.24)$$

so that $\tau_\Omega \circ \lambda_\phi \neq \lambda_\phi \circ \tau_\Omega$ unless G is abelian.

This lack of equivariance means that the transformations (3.21) do not map gauge-orbits in $\mathcal{A}$ into gauge-orbits, and hence do not project down to give maps of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ to itself. In a sense, this is hardly surprising since the set of all transformations of the form (3.21) is a topological vector space whereas $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is topologically non-trivial. Clearly what is needed is some non-abelian group action on $\mathcal{A}$ that preserves the gauge orbits

¹⁶The expression $\Omega(x)d\Omega(x)^{-1}$ is a symbolic way of writing $(\Omega^*\Xi)(x)$ where Ξ is the $L(G)$ -valued Cartan-Maurer one-form on G and $\Omega : \Sigma \rightarrow G$.

and hence does yield a map of $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ to itself. We will see now how a large number of such transformations can be constructed.

First some notation. Let L^v denote the left-invariant vector field on the Lie group G associated with the element $v \in T_e G$, *i.e.*, $(L^v)_g := l_{g*} v$ where $l_g : G \rightarrow G$ is the usual left translation operation, $l_g(g') := gg'$. We recall that the Lie algebra $L(G)$ of G can be identified with the set of all left-invariant vector fields on G , and that the map $v \mapsto L^v$ establishes a vector space isomorphism between $T_e G$ and $L(G)$.

A key step in our construction is the following theorem.

Theorem

Let $\mu : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be any smooth class function¹⁷ on the Lie group G . Then, for all $v \in T_e G$, $g, g' \in G$, the left-invariant vector field L^v satisfies

$$L_{gg'g^{-1}}^v(\mu) = L_{g'}^{\text{Ad}_{g^{-1}}(v)}(\mu) \quad (3.25)$$

where $L^v(\mu)$ denotes the function on G obtained by letting the vector field L^v act on the smooth function μ , and $\text{Ad}_g : T_e G \rightarrow T_e G$ is defined by $\text{Ad}_g(v) := \text{ad}_{g*} v$ where $\text{ad}_g : G \rightarrow G$, $\text{ad}_g(g') := gg'g^{-1}$.

Proof

We have¹⁸

$$L_{gg'g^{-1}}^v(\mu) = (l_{gg'g^{-1}*} v)(\mu) = v(\mu \circ l_{gg'g^{-1}}).$$

But, if $a \in G$,

$$\mu \circ l_{gg'g^{-1}}(a) = \mu(gg'g^{-1}a) = \mu(g'g^{-1}ag) = \mu \circ l_{g'} \circ \text{ad}_{g^{-1}}(a)$$

so that $\mu \circ l_{gg'g^{-1}} = \mu \circ l_{g'} \circ \text{ad}_{g^{-1}}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} L_{gg'g^{-1}}^v(\mu) &= v(\mu \circ l_{g'} \circ \text{ad}_{g^{-1}}) = (\text{ad}_{g^{-1}*} v)(\mu \circ l_{g'}) \\ &= \text{Ad}_{g^{-1}}(v)(\mu \circ l_{g'}) = l_{g'*}(\text{Ad}_{g^{-1}}(v))(\mu) = L_{g'}^{\text{Ad}_{g^{-1}}(v)}(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

QED

To proceed any further it is necessary to concentrate on the situation in which the structure group G admits some $\text{Ad } G$ -invariant inner product on the Lie algebra $L(G)$.

¹⁷A *class* function on a group G is a function $\mu : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that, for all $g, g' \in G$, $\mu(gg'g^{-1}) = \mu(g')$. This implies that $\mu(gg') = \mu(g'g)$ for all $g, g' \in G$.

¹⁸We are using the definition of a tangent vector $v \in T_p M$ at a point p of a manifold M as a local derivation of the ring of smooth functions on M . Thus v is a linear map $v : C^\infty(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$, we have $v(fg) = f(p)v(g) + g(p)v(f)$.

We will denote this inner product by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and, in particular, write $A^v := \langle v, A \rangle$ for $v \in T_e G \simeq L(G)$. Note that to be able to recover A from the set of all $A^v, v \in T_e G$, it is necessary that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be non-degenerate. Note also that, written in terms of the variables A^v , the gauge transformation (3.22) becomes

$$A^v(x) \mapsto (\tau_\Omega A^v)(x) := A^{\Omega(x)^{-1}v\Omega(x)}(x) + \Omega(x)d\Omega(x)^{-1}. \quad (3.26)$$

Now consider the object $L_{P_\alpha(A)}^v$ where $P_\alpha(A) \in G$ is the parallel transport element defined in (2.1), and where α belongs to $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ —the space of *all* continuous, piecewise-smooth loops in Σ , (not just those that map $0 \in S^1$ to the base point x_0). This group element P_α has the gauge-transformation property

$$P_\alpha(\tau_\Omega(A)) = \Omega(\alpha(0))P_\alpha(A)\Omega(\alpha(0))^{-1} \quad (3.27)$$

and hence (3.25) shows that, for any smooth class function $\mu : G \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$L_{P_\alpha(\tau_\Omega(A))}^v(\mu) = L_{\Omega(\alpha(0))P_\alpha(A)\Omega(\alpha(0))^{-1}}^v(\mu) = L_{P_\alpha(A)}^{\Omega^{-1}(\alpha(0))v\Omega(\alpha(0))}(\mu). \quad (3.28)$$

Now let $k \in T_{\alpha(0)}^* \Sigma$ and consider the transformation $\lambda_{(\alpha,k)}$ defined by

$$(\lambda_{(\alpha,k)} A_a^v)(x) := A_a^v(x) + \delta^{(3)}(x, \alpha(0)) k_a L^v(P_\alpha(A)) \quad (3.29)$$

which maps A into a distributional connection and where, for typographical convenience, $L_g^v(\mu)$ has been written as $L^v(g)$. We will return shortly to the distributional nature of this transformation but for the moment let us concentrate on the key property of (3.29) which is its equivariance with respect to gauge transformations:

$$\lambda_{(\alpha,k)}(\tau_\Omega(A^v)) = \tau_\Omega(\lambda_{(\alpha,k)}(A^v)) \quad (3.30)$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_\Sigma$, $k \in T_{\alpha(0)}^* \Sigma$ and $v \in T_e G \simeq L(G)$. This means that (once suitably smeared) the transformations in (3.29) project down to give transformations on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$.

The next step is to clarify the group-theoretic content of these operations. First it should be remarked that the set of all transformations of the type (3.29) do not themselves form a group since the composition of two such transformations $\lambda_{(\alpha,k)}$, $\lambda_{(\alpha',k')}$ cannot be written in this way. Rather, (3.29) is to be viewed as an infinitesimal transformation, and hence associated with a (distributional) vector field $Y_{(\alpha,k)}$ on $\mathcal{A}$. The crucial question is whether or not the commutator of any two such fields can be expressed as a linear combination of fields of this type. If they can then, for example, the set of all finite linear combinations $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i Y_{(\alpha_i, k_i)}$, $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$, forms a genuine Lie algebra.

In performing the calculations it is useful to introduce a basis set $\{E_1, \dots, E_{\dim G}\}$ of $L(G)$ and define $C_{ij} := \langle E_i, E_j \rangle$. Then $A^v = \langle v, A \rangle = \langle v^i E_i, A^{(j)} E_j \rangle = C_{ij} v^i A^{(j)}$

and hence, if C_{ij} is invertible (which we will assume) with inverse C^{ij} , we can write $A^{(i)} = C^{ij}A^{E_j}$, and the transformation (3.29) becomes

$$(\lambda_{(\alpha,k)}A_a^{(i)})(x) := A_a^{(i)}(x) + \delta^{(3)}(x, \alpha(0))k_a C^{ij}L^{E_j}(P_\alpha(A)) \quad (3.31)$$

which corresponds to the vector field

$$Y_{(\alpha,k)}(A) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{\dim G} k_a C^{ij}L^{E_j}(P_\alpha(A)) \frac{\delta}{\delta A_a^{(i)}(\alpha(0))} \quad (3.32)$$

expressed as a functional differential operator on functionals on $\mathcal{A}$.

At this point it is pedagogically useful to restrict our attention to the case where G is a matrix group and can therefore be written as a subgroup of $GL(m, \mathbb{R})$ for some m . The obvious example of a class function on $GL(m, \mathbb{R})$ (or one of its subgroups) is the trace function $\text{Tr} : GL(m, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\text{Tr}(g) := \sum_{i=1}^m g^{ii}$. If the components g^{ij} of a matrix $g \in GL(m, \mathbb{R})$ are regarded as forming a local coordinate system x^{ij} on G (i.e., $x^{ij}(g) := g^{ij}$) then the well-known expression for the left-invariant vector field L_g^v is

$$L_g^v = \sum_{i,j=1}^m (gv)_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{ij}} \right)_g \quad (3.33)$$

where we have identified the tangent space $T_e(GL(m, \mathbb{R}))$ with the space of all $m \times m$ real matrices. Now, since $\text{Tr}(g) = \sum_{i=1}^m x^{ii}(g)$, it follows that, for all $g \in GL(m, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{ij}} \right)_g \text{Tr} = \delta_{ij} \quad (3.34)$$

and hence we have the simple result

$$L_g^v(\text{Tr}) = \text{Tr}(gv). \quad (3.35)$$

The basic transformation (3.31) becomes

$$(\lambda_{(\alpha,k)}A_a^{(i)})(x) := A_a^{(i)}(x) + \delta^{(3)}(x, \alpha(0))k_a C^{ij}\text{Tr}(E_j P_\alpha(A)) \quad (3.36)$$

while the associated vector field is

$$Y_{(\alpha,k)}(A) = \sum_{i,j=1}^m k_a C^{ij}\text{Tr}(E_j P_\alpha(A)) \frac{\delta}{\delta A_a^{(i)}(\alpha(0))}. \quad (3.37)$$

It is now a straightforward matter to compute the commutator of a pair of vector fields of this type. In particular, for the case where $G = SU(n)$ we have $C^{ij}(E_i)_{ab}(E_j)_{cd}$

$= \delta_{ad}\delta_{bc} - \frac{1}{n}\delta_{ab}\delta_{cd}$, and a direct calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} [Y_{(\alpha,k)}, Y_{(\beta,l)}] &= k_a \Delta^a(\alpha(0), \beta)(Y_{(\alpha \circ \beta, l)} - \frac{1}{n}(\text{Tr } P_\alpha)Y_{(\beta, l)}) \\ &\quad - l_a \Delta^a(\beta(0), \alpha)(Y_{(\beta \circ \alpha, k)} - \frac{1}{n}(\text{Tr } P_\beta)Y_{(\alpha, k)}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

where $\Delta^a(\alpha(0), \beta)$ is the distribution (in the variable $\alpha(0) \in \Sigma$) defined by [4]

$$\Delta^a(\alpha(0), \beta) := \int_0^{2\pi} ds \delta^{(3)}(\alpha(0), \beta(s)) \dot{\beta}^a(s). \quad (3.39)$$

Note that $\beta \circ \alpha$ means the composition of the curves α and β at their intersection point $\alpha(0)$. If they do not intersect at either $\alpha(0)$ or $\beta(0)$ then the commutator in (3.38) vanishes. Several remarks should be made about the result (3.38).

1. The algebra in (3.38) was first obtained by Gambini and Trias in their discussion of the canonical quantisation of Yang-Mills theory [23]. Their algebra is that of the commutators of quantum operators and, as we now see, it follows from the basic transformation law (3.29) on the classical configuration space.

2. A priori, the vector field commutator (3.38) does *not* yield a genuine Lie algebra since the right hand side contains the explicit functions $\text{Tr}(P_\alpha)$ of the canonical variables A . However, we can always write

$$\text{Tr}(E_i P_\beta) = \text{Tr}(E_i P_\beta(0, u_\alpha) P_\beta(u_\alpha, 2\pi)) = \text{Tr}(P_\beta(u_\alpha, 2\pi) E_i P_\beta(0, u_\alpha)) \quad (3.40)$$

where u_α is a value of u such that $\beta(u_\alpha) = \alpha(0)$, and where $P_\beta(0, u_\alpha)$ denotes the parallel transport along the loop β from the point $\beta(0)$ to $\beta(u_\alpha)$. In the special case when the structure group G is $SU(2)$ the familiar relation $\text{Tr}(A)\text{Tr}(B) = \text{Tr}(AB) + \text{Tr}(AB^{-1})$ can be used to expand terms like $(\text{Tr } P_\alpha)Y_{(\beta, l)}$ to give

$$\begin{aligned} [Y_{(\alpha,k)}, Y_{(\beta,l)}] &= \frac{1}{2} k_a \Delta^a(\alpha(0), \beta)(Y_{(\alpha \circ \beta, l)} - Y_{(\alpha^{-1} \circ \beta, l)}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} l_a \Delta^a(\beta(0), \alpha)(Y_{(\beta \circ \alpha, k)} - Y_{(\beta^{-1} \circ \alpha, k)}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

which *is* a genuine Lie algebra, albeit still with distributional structure constants. Thus we see another example of the special role of the choice $G = SU(2)$: it is the only one of the $SU(n)$ series in which the vector fields associated with the transformation (3.29) produce a proper Lie algebra.

3. The algebra (3.41) is precisely that obtained by Rovelli and Smolin for the Poisson-bracket relations of their T^1 -variables (which use the group $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$). In fact each vector field $Y_{(\alpha, k)}$ gives rise to a unique T^1 variable according to the usual rule that associates

vector fields with functions on a symplectic manifold. Similarly, if we let the vector field $Y_{(\alpha,k)}$ act on the particular function $T_\beta := \frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}(P_\beta)$ then, for the special case $G = SU(2)$, we find

$$Y_{(\alpha,k)}(T_\beta) = k_a \Delta^a(\alpha(0), \beta)(T_{\alpha \circ \beta} - T_{\alpha^{-1} \circ \beta}) \quad (3.42)$$

and the right hand side is just the Poisson bracket of the T^1 -variable with the T -variable, which re-emphasises the connection with the work of Rovelli and Smolin. Again, we note the special role of the group $SU(2)$.

3.4 The strip variables and distributional elements of Δ

The presence of the Dirac δ -function on the right hand side of (3.29) means this basic transformation is not really a map from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ but rather a map from $\mathcal{A}$ to a space of distributional connections. To secure a transformation from $\mathcal{A}$ to itself it is necessary to smear (3.29) in some way. On the other hand, the existence of the distributional transformation (3.29) suggests the possibility of constructing “distributional” elements of Δ . We wish to consider both these topics in the present section.

The δ -function might be removed by “integrating” over the loops α . Note that, at least formally, for any measure ν on the loop space $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$, and any one-form ω on Σ , the object ¹⁹

$$\Theta_a^{v,\omega,\nu}[A, x] := \int_{\mathcal{L}_\Sigma} d\nu(\alpha) \delta^{(3)}(x, \alpha(0)) \omega_a(\alpha(0)) L^v(P_\alpha(A)) \quad (3.43)$$

behaves under gauge transformations as

$$\Theta_a^{v,\omega,\nu}[\tau_\Omega A, x] = \Theta_a^{\Omega(x)^{-1}v\Omega(x),\omega,\nu}[A, x] \quad (3.44)$$

and hence

$$A_a^v(x) \mapsto A_a^v(x) + \Theta_a^{v,\omega,\nu}[A, x] \quad (3.45)$$

is an equivariant map from $\mathcal{A}$ into (a possibly distributional version of) $\mathcal{A}$.

This issue of whether, and how, to remove the δ -function is related to the general question of how the Lie algebra should be constructed from the generators labelled by the pairs (α, k) . The simplest choice is to take just the set of all finite linear combinations of these generators or, perhaps, the limit of such in some suitable topology. This corresponds to the use of a discrete measure on the loop space $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$. One might also try a more general integral over $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$, although it is not easy to construct measures on this space, or to make any a priori decision about what types of measure are appropriate for our purposes.

¹⁹The notation $\Theta[A, x]$ is used to emphasise that Θ is to be thought of as a functional of $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and a function of the point $x \in \Sigma$.

One approach is to seek to smear the loops in such a way that a smooth function is obtained so that the transformation (3.45) is an equivariant map from $\mathcal{A}$ to itself. However, it is also possible that the space $\mathcal{A}$ should be extended to include genuine distributions. As we have argued already, this certainly might be expected at the quantum level. This is particularly relevant if we consider again the space Δ and try to use the transformation (3.45) to construct elements that are not of the form h_A where $A \in \mathcal{A}$. That this is indeed possible can be seen from the following argument.

If the $\delta^{(3)}$ -function is subjected to a line integral over a loop we are left with a $\delta^{(2)}$ -singularity. Therefore if the singular connection on the right hand side of (3.29) is smeared with a two-dimensional integral over the position of the starting point $\alpha(0)$ of the loop α , the resulting (still distributional) connection A should give rise to a genuine $h_A \in \Delta$. This is because the construction of $h_A(\gamma)$ involves integrating over the loop γ , which removes the remaining singularity. This idea can be given a precise formulation by considering “strips” in Σ , *i.e.*, maps $S : S^1 \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \longrightarrow \Sigma$ (for some $\epsilon > 0$) that can be thought of as one-parameter families of loops. Let u and v denote respectively the parameter around the circle S^1 and the parameter in $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$. Then we define (*cf* (3.43))

$$\Theta_a^{S,v}[A, x] := \int_0^{2\pi} du \int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} dv \delta^{(3)}(x, S(u, v)) \dot{S}_v^b(u) \dot{S}_u^c(v) \epsilon_{abc} L^v(P_{S_{v,u}}(A)) \quad (3.46)$$

where $S_u : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \longrightarrow \Sigma$ and $S_v : S^1 \longrightarrow \Sigma$ are defined by $S_u(v) = S_v(u) := S(u, v)$, and $S_{v,u}$ is the loop defined by $S_{v,u}(t) := S_v(u + t \bmod 2\pi)$. Thus we have constructed a rather special measure ν on $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ by integrating over a one-parameter family of loops and over the point on each individual loop at which that loop is deemed to start.

Concerning the problem of finding transformation groups of gauge-equivalence classes of connections we note that (as emphasised in the context of (3.43–3.45)) the map $A_a^v(x) \mapsto A_a^v(x) + \Theta_a^{S,v}[A, x]$ is equivariant with respect to gauge transformations and corresponds to the (still distributional) vector field Y_S on $\mathcal{A}$ defined by

$$Y_S := C^{ij} \int_0^{2\pi} du \int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} dv \dot{S}_v^b(u) \dot{S}_u^c(v) \epsilon_{abc} L^{E_i}(P_{S_{u,v}}(A)) \frac{\delta}{\delta A_c^{(j)}(S(u, v))}. \quad (3.47)$$

The vector fields corresponding to a pair of strips S_1 and S_2 have a vanishing commutator if S_1 and S_2 do not intersect. If they intersect just once the relations are

$$[Y_{S_1}, Y_{S_2}] = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon(S_1, S_2) (Y_{S_1 \circ S_2} - Y_{S_1 \circ S_2^{-1}}) \quad (3.48)$$

where $\epsilon(S_1, S_2) = \pm 1$ according to the orientations of the strips, and where $S_1 \circ S_2$ denotes the strip formed by all the loops in the parts of the strips that intersect. If the strips intersect more than once then (3.48) is replaced by a sum of terms, one corresponding to each intersection region.

The Poisson-bracket analogue of this algebra was mentioned by Rovelli in his recent review [5] and is ascribed by him to Smolin. We expect this algebra to play a key role in the full quantum theory of any system with configuration space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$. In particular, we note that it is a *genuine* Lie algebra with structure constants that are real numbers, not distributions. Thus, for example, it is meaningful to ask if the algebra can be exponentiated to give a proper (infinite-dimensional) Lie group. Note however that any such group would not act on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ since the vector fields Y_S themselves *do* still contain distributional features, even though their commutators do not. The proper role of this group appears rather to be as a group of automorphisms of the holonomy algebra $\mathcal{HA}$ and hence, by implication, a group of transformations of the ideal space Δ .

Indeed, from the view point of our study of Δ the crucial remark is that, at least formally, $\Theta^{S,v}[A, x]$ can be used to form a non-standard element of this space. Specifically, we define

$$\begin{aligned} h_{(A,S)}(\gamma) &:= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathcal{P} \exp \oint_{\gamma} (A + \Theta^S[A]) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathcal{P} \exp \int_0^{2\pi} dt \dot{\gamma}^a(t) \left(A_a(\gamma(t)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + C^{ij} E_j \int_0^{2\pi} du \int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} dv \dot{S}_v^b(u) \dot{S}_u^c(v) \epsilon_{abc} L^{E_i}(P_{S_{v,u}}(A)) \right) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

which clearly satisfies the boundedness condition (2.25). The algebraic condition (2.23) is true by construction, and the condition (2.24) is also true under the assumption that the topology on $\mathcal{A}$ is such that the classical T -variables extend continuously from functions on $\mathcal{A}$ to functions on the set of distributional one-forms on Σ of which $\mathcal{A}$ is a dense subset.

The three conditions (2.23–2.25) are sufficient to guarantee that (3.49) defines a multiplicative functional on the holonomy algebra $\mathcal{HA}$ although it is not completely obvious that this extends to the full C^* -algebra completion $C^*(\mathcal{HA})$ of $\mathcal{HA}$. However, we believe that this is the case, if for no other reason than that, with hindsight, is clear that the formal representation (1.8) has a natural extension to distributional connections of the type above with

$$(\hat{T}_\alpha \Psi)([A]_{\mathcal{G}}, S) := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathcal{P} \exp \oint_{\alpha} (A + \Theta^S[A]) \right\} \Psi([A]_{\mathcal{G}}, S) \quad (3.50)$$

where A is a smooth connection and S is a strip. Indeed, so natural is the representation (3.50) that we are inclined to conjecture that elements of Δ of this type are *sufficient* for the quantum theory of the T -variables, *i.e.*, there is some sense in which all representations of the quantum T -algebra can be written in the form (3.50).

4 CONCLUSION

Let us begin by recalling a few facts from the quantum theory of scalar fields in Minkowski spacetime. In this case, the algebra of operators is obtained by smearing the field operators $\hat{\phi}(x)$ with test fields $f(x)$ which belong to a suitable topological space E of smooth functions, while quantum states $\Psi(\chi)$ are defined on the *dual* E' of E ; in particular, the argument χ can be a distribution. The space E is typically dense in E' in a natural topology. However, the inner product is defined using measures on E' that are typically concentrated on genuine distributions. The operators and states—and hence the spaces E and E' —“interact” with one another to define the generating functional (2.34) which determines the measure completely.

The overall framework we have constructed in this paper for gauge theories and gravity is rather similar, except for a striking difference that arises in the very first step: the introduction of the algebra of quantum operators. To maintain manifest gauge invariance, we chose our basic operators to correspond to traces of holonomies $\hat{T}_\alpha$ around closed loops α . In effect, this means that we are using *distributions*, concentrated on loops, as smearing fields for operators. This is indeed quite unusual. For example, even in the abelian case, the Fock representation can not support the $\hat{T}_\alpha$ operators (without some sort of additional smearing). We have shown that, in spite of this difference, in theories with real connections, the operators $\hat{T}_\alpha$ can be given the structure of a genuine C^* -algebra. Furthermore, thanks to the powerful machinery of the Gel'fand spectral theory, we could obtain the form of its general cyclic representation. The underlying Hilbert space of states is always $L^2(\Delta, d\mu)$, where Δ is the space of maximal ideals of the C^* -algebra and $d\mu$ is a regular measure on this compact, Hausdorff space. The operators $\hat{T}_\alpha$ act simply by multiplication: $(\hat{T}_\alpha \Psi)(h) = h(\alpha)\Psi(h)$. These results also enabled us to give a precise mathematical meaning to the “loop transform” introduced by Rovelli and Smolin.

Since in conventional quantum field theory the domain space of states is the space of distributions that belong to the dual of the classical configuration space, and since the configuration space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ of gauge theories and gravity is a complicated manifold, one of the goals of this paper was to explore what the distributional dual to $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ might be. We found that there is a well-defined sense in which the ideal space Δ plays this role. Thus, the situation with quantum states is rather similar to that in conventional quantum field theory. Furthermore, the measure that defines the inner product arises from a generating functional (2.28) whose form is analogous to that of (2.34) encountered in a conventional field theory. Since the generators $\hat{T}_\alpha$ of our holonomy algebra are labelled by loops, any functional on the space $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ of loops satisfying certain conditions (namely (2.33)) defines a generating functional and hence a representation of our C^* -algebra. From the standpoint of the general representation theory, it appears that this is in fact the most

natural role for functionals of loops in the quantum description.

We were able to obtain a number of explicit examples of such functionals. The last three of these are likely to be useful in exploring certain aspects of topological field theories, Yang-Mills theory and model systems—such as the one of Husain and Kuchař [11]—that share certain features with full general relativity.

However, these examples are too simple to carry the full content of the dynamics of Yang-Mills theory or general relativity in 3+1 dimensions. It is therefore essential to have a better understanding of the general representation theory and in particular of the structure of the domain space Δ of quantum states. We obtained several results along these lines. As expected, the classical configuration space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ is embedded in Δ , and $\Delta - \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ may be regarded as the space of gauge-equivalence classes of “genuinely distributional connections”. To gain insight into these objects, we associated with each 2-dimensional “strip” in the spatial 3-manifold Σ , a distributional vector field Θ^S on $\mathcal{A}$ and showed that the connections $A + \Theta^S$ lead to well-defined elements of Δ . While we have not been able to provide a complete analysis of the structure of Δ , nonetheless there are reasons to believe that the elements of Δ that arise from strips may be the only genuinely distributional connections that are needed in the quantum theory.

As noted in section 3, however, the holonomy operators $\hat{T}_\alpha$ correspond only to the configuration variables. It turns out that the appropriate momentum variables—which must be linear in e_i^a , the variables conjugate to the connections A_a^i —are associated precisely with the vector fields Θ^S on the configuration space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$ that are labelled by the 2-dimensional strips S . They are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{T}_S(A, e) : &= \int_\Sigma d^3x \Theta_a^{S, E_i} e_{(i)}^a \\ &= C^{ij} \int_0^{2\pi} du \int_{-\epsilon}^\epsilon dv \dot{S}_v^b \dot{S}_u^c \epsilon_{abc} L^{E_i}(P_{S_{u,v}}(A)) e_j^a.\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

These loop-strip variables are complete in an appropriate sense and, furthermore, are closed under Poisson brackets with the algebra in (3.48). The Poisson bracket operation involves just gluing and breaking the loops and strips, and it is quite remarkable that these simple geometric operations code the entire symplectic structure of Yang-Mills theory and/or general relativity. The structure of this algebra is so simple and geometrically pleasing that we expect it to play an important role in the quantum theory of any system whose configuration space is of the form $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$.

To complete the discussion of quantum kinematics, it is necessary to find representations of the corresponding loop-strip operator algebra. Each of them would, by restriction, yield a representation of the holonomy algebra. Since we now know the structure of the *general* representations of this algebra, it remains to see which of them can also support our momentum operators. Among the explicit examples discussed in

section 2.4, the first two—the finite dimensional representations—do not do so. However, it does appear that the remaining three representations *can*. If this expectation survives detailed examination one would have, in particular, a handle on certain non-perturbative aspects of Yang-Mills theory. We are currently investigating these and other aspects of the loop-strip algebra. In the next paper in this series, we will report on one part of this analysis. We will focus on two model systems—2+1-dimensional gravity and the $U(1)$ (or, Maxwell) theory—and analyse systematically the structure and the representations of the loop-strip algebras in these cases.

In a third paper, we hope to return to 3+1-dimensional general relativity. In this case, the list of open issues is rather long. First, there is the problem of reality conditions, *i.e.*, of the $\star$ -relations on $\mathcal{HA}$. One might want to by-pass this temporarily by focussing on gravitational fields with one (space-like) Killing vector, in which case the connection is real. However, it now takes values in the Lie-algebra of $SU(1,1)$ —so that the traces of holonomies are unbounded—and is generically non-flat. Therefore, the strategies that led successfully to a norm on the holonomy algebra $\mathcal{HA}$ in the $SU(2)$ -case as well as in the case of 2+1-dimensional gravity now fail and one must investigate other avenues.

Finally, there is an important and qualitatively different issue that has remained almost entirely unexplored. In Yang-Mills theory, we have to worry only about the Gauss constraint, and the strategy of using manifestly gauge-invariant variables—holonomies $T_\alpha(A)$ and the momenta $T_S(A, e)$ —is well-suited to handle it. On the other hand, in general relativity, the corresponding “kinematical gauge symmetries” also include spatial diffeomorphisms, and it is quite unnatural to treat the Gauss constraint on a different footing from the vector constraints. One therefore suspects that the loop-strip variables may not be the most appropriate ones. Is there another set of variables which is invariant not only under the internal gauge rotations but also under spatial diffeomorphisms? It would clearly be advantageous to build a quantum C^* -algebra which is based directly on such variables.

Acknowledgements

This work was motivated by certain key ideas introduced into non-perturbative canonical gravity by Carlo Rovelli and Lee Smolin. We have benefited greatly from the numerous discussions we have had with them over the years. This work was supported in part by the NSF grant PHY 90-16733, the SERC Senior Visiting Fellowship GR/G3499, and by research funds provided by Syracuse University.

References

- [1] A. Ashtekar. Phys. Rev. **D36** (1987) 1587–1602.
- [2] A. Ashtekar. Phys. Rev. Lett. **57** (1986) 2244–2247.
- [3] T. Jacobson and L. Smolin. Nucl. Phys. **B299** (1988) 295–345.
- [4] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin. Nucl. Phys. **B331** (1990) 80–152.
- [5] C. Rovelli. (1991). Pittsburgh University preprint.
- [6] A. Ashtekar and C. Rovelli. (1991). Syracuse University preprint.
- [7] A. Ashtekar. Lectures on Non-Perturbative Canonical Gravity. (World Scientific Press, Singapore, 1991).
- [8] A. Ashtekar and C.J. Isham. Phys. Lett. (1992). In press.
- [9] I.M. Gel’fand and N. Ya. Vilenkin. Generalized Functions, Volume 4: Applications of Harmonic Analysis. (Academic Press, New York, 1964).
- [10] Y. Yamasaki. Measures on Infinite Dimensional Spaces. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985).
- [11] V. Husain and K. Kuchař. Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 4070–4077.
- [12] E. Witten. Nucl. Phys. **B311** (1988) 46–78.
- [13] A. Ashtekar, V. Husain, J. Samuel and L. Smolin. Class. Quan. Grav. **6** (1989) L185–L193.
- [14] P.K. Mitter and C.M. Viallet. Comm. Math. Phys **79** (1981) 43–58.
- [15] C.J. Isham. Topological and global aspects of quantum theory. In Relativity, Groups and Topology II, Edited by B.S. DeWitt and R.. Stora, p. 1062–1290. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [16] J.N. Goldberg, J. Lewandowski and C. Stornioli. (1991). Syracuse University preprint.
- [17] S. Mandelstam. Phys. Rev. **D19** (1979) 2391–2409.
- [18] R. Loll. Nucl. Phys. **B350** (1991) 831–860.
- [19] R. Gambini and A. Trias. Phys. Rev. **D23** (1980) 553–555.

- [20] J. Anadan. Holonomy groups in gravity and gauge fields. In Proceedings of the Conference on Differential Geometric Methods in Theoretical Physics, Trieste 1981, Edited by G. Denardo and H.D. Doebner, Singapore, 1983. World Scientific.
- [21] J. Barrett. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **30** (1991) 1171–1215.
- [22] R. Giles. Phys. Rev. **D24** (1981) 2160–2168.
- [23] R. Gambini and A. Trias. Nucl. Phys. **B278** (1986) 436–448.
- [24] J.L. Kelly. General Topology. (Van Nostrand, London, 1970).
- [25] S. Kobayashi. Comptes Rendus **238** (1954) 443–444.
- [26] E. Hewitt. Duke. Math. Jour **14** (1947) 419–427.